Daily Report

Soviet Union

FBIS-SOV-91-082
Monday
29 April 1991

Daily Report
Soviet Union

FBIS-SOV-91-082 *29 April 1991*

CONTENTS

NOTICE TO READERS: An * indicates material not disseminated in electronic form.

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

United States & Canada

Bessmertnykh Discusses Talks With Baker *[Moscow TV]* 1
Baker Reportedly Seeks 'Help' on Near East *[KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 26 Apr]* 2
U.S. 'Legitimacy' in Mideast Viewed *[Moscow Radio]* 3
U.S. Plan for 'Bombing Attacks' Viewed *[Moscow International]* 3
General Moiseyev To Visit Canada in May *[TASS]* 4

China

Falin Discusses Jiang Visit With CPC Official *[PRAVDA 24 Apr]* 4
Gidaspov Describes Talks With Jiang Zemin *[Moscow International]* 4
Alekseyev Comments on Current Sino-Soviet Ties *[Moscow International]* 5

Northeast Asia

No Tae-u Confirms Agreement To Sign Treaty *[Moscow International]* 5
Commentator Views PRC-ROK Relations *[Moscow International]* 5
Bessmertnykh, DPRK Ambassador Confer *[PRAVDA 24 Apr]* 6
Trade Agreement Signed With DPRK *[TASS]* 6

Southeast Asia & Pacific

Bessmertnykh Meets With Cambodian Counterpart *[IZVESTIYA 25 Apr]* 6
Commentary on Gorbachev Asian Security Proposal *[Moscow International]* 7
Commentary Views Asia-Pacific Policy *[TASS]* 7

Near East & South Asia

Bessmertnykh on 'Opportunity' for Mideast Peace *[Berlin ADN]* 8
Commentary on Palestinian Central Council Session *[Moscow International]* 8
Israeli Diplomat on Mideast Issues, Soviet Ties *[Moscow TV]* 9

East Europe

Issue of Hungary-Based Nuclear Arms Considered *[Moscow Radio]* 10
Hungary Suspends Medicine Delivery to USSR *[IZVESTIYA 20 Apr]* 10
'Delicate Questions' Jeopardize Romanian Ties *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 25 Apr]* 11

West Europe

Council of Europe Support for Reforms Noted *[TASS]* 12

NATIONAL AFFAIRS

Supreme Soviet

USSR Supreme Soviet Proceedings 25 Apr *[Moscow TV]* 14
Legislature Discusses Moldova 25 Apr *[Moscow Radio]* 14
Nishanov Remarks on Moldova *[Moscow TV]* 16

Further on Nishanov Remarks *[Moscow TV]* 16
Akhromeyev on Moldova *[Moscow TV]* 16
Kiselev on Moldova *[Moscow TV]* 17
USSR Supreme Soviet Proceedings 26 Apr *[Moscow TV]* 18
Gorbachev Addresses Supreme Soviet 26 Apr *[PRAVDA 27 Apr]* 19
Gorbachev Answers Questions *[Moscow TV]* 23
Deputy Comments on Gorbachev Speech *[Radio Rossii]* 26
Resolution on Japan, ROK Visits *[PRAVDA 27 Apr]* 27
Gorbachev on Joint Statement With Leaders *[TASS]* 27
Lukyanov Highlights Labor Legislation Conflict *[Moscow TV]* 28
Gorbachev Veto Discussed *[TASS]* 29
Nuclear Safety Law Adopted *[Moscow Radio]* 29

Political & Social

Falin: Gorbachev Should Remain Party Leader *[Moscow Radio]* 29
President's Five-Point Crisis Program Lauded *[PRAVDA 25 Apr]* 30
Fokin Praises Outcome of Republican Meeting *[TASS]* 30
Shcherbakov Views Trade Union-Government Accord *[Moscow TV]* 31
CPSU Military Policy Commission Meets *[PRAVDA 27 Apr]* 32
Pavlov: Cabinet Refers to Sakharov, Solzhenitsyn *[Moscow TV]* 33
TASS Reviews Press for 27 Apr 33
TASS Reviews PRAVDA for 29 Apr 33
Faltering Reform, Gorbachev Status Viewed *[PRAVDA 22 Apr]* 34
Moscow Warning Strike Lacks Support *[TASS]* 37
Ban on Armed Formations Reviewed *[TASS]* 37
Moscow City Federation Issues May Day Appeal *[Moscow Radio]* 37
Further on Republic Interparliamentary Conference *[IZVESTIYA 24 Apr]* 37
Public Order Reportedly 'Considerably Worsened' *[TASS]* 38
New Asia-Pacific Department Established *[TASS]* 38

Economic

Striking Miners Begin Returning to Work *[Moscow Radio]* 38
Kuzbass Miners' Strike Crumbles *[TASS]* 39
Nine Vorkuta Mines Suspend Strikes *[TASS]* 39

Military

First Deputy Defense Minister Removed *[TASS]* 39
Swedish Army Commander Arrives for Visit 39
Meets With Moiseyev *[TASS]* 39
Holds Talks With Yazov *[TASS]* 40

REGIONAL AFFAIRS

Baltic Republics

Communist Party Congress Held in Riga 27 Apr 41
Discuss 'Strategies' *[TASS]* 41
Coordinating Council Formed *[TASS]* 41
Problems, Prospects Viewed *[Moscow Radio]* 41
Soviet-Lithuanian Talks Reportedly Set for May *[Moscow Radio]* 42
Landsbergis, Doguzhiyev Discuss Bank Seizure *[IZVESTIYA 26 Apr]* 42
Landsbergis Urges Non-Cooperation With Army *[Radio Vilnius]* 42
Landsbergis Warns of Continuing Danger *[Radio Vilnius]* 42
Lithuania Threatens Separate Monetary System *[Vilnius International]* 43
Lithuanian Statement on Attacks on Property *[Radio Vilnius]* 43
Lithuanian, Soviet Officials Sign Protocol *[Vilnius International]* 43

RSFSR

Democratic Party Holds First Congress in Moscow 44
Backs Stability Statement *[TASS]* 44
Supports Yeltsin as President *[Moscow Radio]* 44
Ratifies People's Accord Bloc *[Moscow Radio]* 44
Rift Apparent at Congress *[TASS]* 45
Chairman Denies Split *[Moscow Radio]* 45
Congress Ends *[TASS]* 46
Joint Session Supports Stabilization Efforts *[TASS]* 46
Gorbachev-Republics Joint Statement Supported *[TASS]* 46
Agenda for Congress of People's Deputies Approved *[TASS]* 47
Supreme Soviet Endorses Statistics Chairman *[Moscow Radio]* 47
Yeltsin Addresses Supreme Soviet on Chernobyl *[Moscow TV]* 47
29 Apr Rally To Endorse Yeltsin Presidency *[KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 27 Apr]* 48
Democratic Russia Nominates Yeltsin for President *[TASS]* 48
Bakatin Nominated for RSFSR President *[Moscow Radio]* 49
Warning Protests Staged by Unions in RSFSR *[Radio Rossii]* 49
Yeltsin, Kryuchkov To Discuss Russian KGB *[Radio Rossii]* 49
RSFSR Politburo Member Assesses Congress *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 23 Apr]* 49

Western Republics

Minsk Strike Committee Suspends Action *[TASS]* 52
Belorussian Leader on Reason for Price Protests *[Moscow TV]* 53
Chernobyl 'Catastrophe' Fifth Anniversary Marked 53
2 Million Risk Contamination *[Moscow Radio]* 53
Foreign Aid Provided *[TASS]* 53
UN Mission Arrives in Minsk *[TASS]* 54
International Help Urged *[TASS]* 54
Official's Fears Noted *[Berlin ADN]* 54
Ukrainian Students End Strike 25 Apr *[Kiev International]* 55
Snegur Cables Gorbachev on Banking 'War' *[TASS]* 55

Caucasus

Georgian Resolution on Post of President *[NRZAVISIMAYA GRUZIYA 10 Apr]* 55
Armenian Surrender of Party Building Delayed *[TASS]* 56
Armenian Communist Party Holds Congress *[Moscow TV]* 56
Refuses To Give Up Building *[TASS]* 56
Mutalibov Statement Warns Armenians *[Baku Radio]* 57
Mutalibov Supports Union of Sovereign States *[TASS]* 58
Azeri President on Russia's Future, Problems *[Radio Rossii]* 58

Central Asia

Uzbek President on Republics' Joint Statement *[Moscow TV]* 59
Kyrgyz Communist Party Makes Leadership Changes *[SLOVO KYRGYZSTANA 9 Apr]* 60

United States & Canada

Bessmertnykh Discusses Talks With Baker

LD2704181191 Moscow Central Television First Program Network in Russian 1920 GMT 26 Apr 91

["Topical Interview" program: Interview with USSR Foreign Minister Aleksandr Aleksandrovich Bessmertnykh by correspondent P. Guskov; place and date not given—recorded]

[Text] [Guskov] Aleksandr Aleksandrovich, you arrived for the Kislovodsk meeting after talks with representatives of the PLO, and U.S. Secretary of State James Baker arrived by air from the Near East. This, indeed, made one assume that Near East problems would be a subject of discussion, and it followed from your meeting with the press that these assumptions were vindicated. The Near East is very close to us, and Soviet people are very concerned by this problem.

[Bessmertnykh] I arrived for the Kislovodsk meeting not only after a conversation with the Palestinians, although that had indeed taken place on the eve, but also after fairly intensive contacts with Arab states, including Syria. As you know, its foreign minister came to us recently. There had also been contacts with Israel. This is to say that we have been able, with the main participants of the future peace process, to discuss the primary ways by which it might be possible to arrive at a peaceful settlement.

We maintained contact with Baker on the Near East issue, one might say, from January, when for the first time in many years the two ministers issued a joint statement on a Near East settlement. Since then, we have been in contact by correspondence, telephone conversations, and personal meetings. You will probably recall that, after his first round in the Near East, Baker came to Moscow and we discussed the problem with him. The Kislovodsk meeting was, thus, brought about by a need to share the experience accumulated by the two sides and to compare the sides' views on the way to seeking, I would say, the initial stage of launching a Near East settlement. We discovered quite a few points of contact and Baker and I consider that the outlook for a Near East peace conference is more encouraging than it was some time ago. If we get this peace conference under way, then naturally all the sides in the conflict will have the opportunity to discuss and resolve all the remaining chronic problems in respect to their mutual relations. For all intents and purposes, the stereotype situation of many years' standing, where the sides in general have had no contact with each other, will have been broken, and this is necessary.

The time has come when it is necessary to seek a solution. Guided by this and, as you very rightly said, our concern over the fact that the Near East region is so close to our borders and we are therefore particularly interested in its settlement, we have deemed it possible to attempt together, with the United States, to arrive at a joint aegis for holding such a peace conference. All the participants in the conflict agree with this and, naturally, on both sides. Their friends in the region are encouraging them. I think that this promises the possibility of moving to constructive business on this issue. A chance has appeared, a real chance, a chance which we do not want to let slip.

[Guskov] It gives hope.

[Bessmertnykh] Yes, there is hope, although I want to say again that there are a lot, of course, complicated angles to this problem. The positions of some participants in the conflict are very frozen, so to speak, for natural reasons.

[Guskov] Chronic pains, resentments...

[Bessmertnykh, interrupting] Chronic pains, resentments, fears, apprehensions—all of this together. For this reason, these countries are appealing to the USSR and the United States to help begin this process. Our meeting in Kislovodsk, in essence, stresses the continuity and the continuing character of the positive development of USSR-U.S. relations. But, you see, not only the Near East was discussed here, although you are right, it was at the center of our attention. We discussed other problems which concern Washington and Moscow. The problem of arms limitation, we discussed questions concerning the conclusion of work on the ratification processes connected to conventional weapons. We discussed the state of things at the talks in Geneva on strategic offensive weapons. We discussed a number of regional problems, including Afghanistan and others. This meeting was fairly full.

[Guskov] When the meeting with press ended, one of my U.S. colleagues said: No date, nothing. He was, of course, talking about whether a date was agreed for the next meeting of the USSR president and the U.S. president.

[Bessmertnykh] We did not discuss this question directly. We did not discuss it, not because it is not of interest, but because it was not its turn yet. We did not discuss it only because the concept of the coming summit meeting which was agreed between the two countries is very clear to us, and to some degree the time framework in which this meeting is to take place is also agreed. Nothing has changed; that is, as before, such a meeting is possible in the first half of this year. However, not too much of this first half is left, but not too little either. To hold this meeting at the level which is befitting, work must be concluded in the first place on the treaties which I have mentioned, primarily the treaty on strategic offensive weapons reductions and limitations. It is necessary to complete the work on the treaties I have mentioned, above all on the treaty on reducing and limiting strategic offensive weapons. We have advanced far enough here. There are just a few problems left.

[Gusev] In a word, journalists have not got long to wait before another important event.

[Bessmertnykh] In this respect, journalists are encouraged by their very desire—the desire which has existed both among U.S. and USSR journalists—the desire to see that the meeting should, nevertheless, take place.

[Gusev] Yes, one can sense that.

[Bessmertnykh] Yes, the fact that there is the understanding, the understanding of the importance of it, is very good.

[Gusev] We live in very hard times for our country. Could you tell us, is it difficult to be the foreign minister at this time?

[Bessmertnykh] Yes, the times are indeed difficult, but all the more responsibility lies, I believe, with our foreign policy and our diplomacy. Incidentally, in the next few days—today or tomorrow—it will be my first 100 days in this post.

[Guskov] There is the first stock to take, is there not?

[Bessmertnykh] You know, thus far the results have been quantitative. In other words, during that time, while being in this post, I have managed to learn a lot about it, to meet 30 or 40 foreign ministers, and to make sense of certain things in our foreign affairs. In my view, among the directions that we have chosen and in which we have, in fact, done a great deal, one of the most important ones is that we have tried to underpin the idea of good-neighborliness with real meaning. The country must be surrounded by a circle of genuine good-neighborliness, friendliness, and cooperation. If you consider my recent trips, then it will become clear to you that they all followed mainly the periphery of our country. To a certain extent, that is the result of taking up some idea from our traditional Russian diplomacy which paid a great deal of attention to development of relations, above all with neighboring and adjacent countries.

If a circle like this emerges, is created, and will acquire the pulse of life, as it were, I think this will affect the well-being of our people for we are surrounded by a multitude of countries ready to exchange goods with us. Sometimes, these countries have been neglected from the viewpoint of foreign economic relations and forgotten by our foreign trade organizations because they were of no interest as far as the volume of all possibilities is concerned, or for some other reasons.

When I arrived in Greece, I found that our foreign economic ties are at a completely miserly level. That country is ready to cooperate with us and can supply a great deal. Turkey is another example: Here is a country that has reached a high level of economic development and that needs markets. We are a vast market, so encouragement should be given. Take even Iran, let alone Japan, Korea, and China. With the latter, we have now developed very powerful relations, and we have attained great progress in these relations. Take East European countries: I have met all the foreign ministers of these countries and talked to them and to some of the premiers.

You know, after a year of their interpretation, their evaluation of the azimuth of their policy, they are arriving at the conviction that, without the USSR and without the development of relations with the Soviet Union, they are practically unable to survive. Therefore, there is this sort of tendency, on a new basis now, to build relations with us. We encourage and support this tendency. Now, we are restructuring these links. We are underpinning them with new treaties and agreements, and relations will be completely different, perhaps even more reliable than those which existed before. The peoples are striving for this, and the governments as well, so this is also an area of our very active cooperation. I am not speaking here of Europe, where, as was previously the case, there is great interest in any so-called manifestation of ours, be it economic, political, or of any other kind. In order for everything to go completely smoothly, we need to set our domestic affairs straight. I have already spoken about the fact that there is a link between domestic and foreign policy, and the better things are in our domestic policy, then the easier it is to work with foreign policy. However, when there are difficulties in domestic policy, then we need to work more actively on our foreign policy. This is just what we are doing now.

Baker Reportedly Seeks 'Help' on Near East

PM2604122791 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 26 Apr 91 p 3

[A. Vasilyev report: "To Kislovodsk for Help"]

[Text] USSR Foreign Minister A.A. Bessmertnykh met with U.S. Secretary of State J. Baker in Kislovodsk yesterday. It is symbolic that Baker arrived in Kislovodsk from the Near East, and will return there after the meeting. It graphically demonstrates the fact that the Soviet Union is a natural participant in the Near East settlement process, and has preserved and even strengthened its influence there after the war in the Persian Gulf.

The U.S. secretary of state came to Kislovodsk to ask for Moscow's help. The fact is that, prior to this, he had had talks with Syrian President Hafiz al-Asad on a plan for holding a peace conference on the Near East. The essence of the problem is that Israel resolutely opposes UN [as published] participation in this conference, hoping to reach agreement with the Arab countries one by one on the territories it occupies and the fate of the Palestinian people. The United States also inclines toward this option. However, the Arab countries—and Syria in particular—want to present a united front at the negotiations with Israel. This is why, before arriving in Kislovodsk—according to the testimony of U.S. journalists—Baker "had had only three hours sleep, and was testy and irritable": He had been unable to persuade al-Asad.

The Americans' last hope is the Soviet Union, which enjoys influence in Syria. So far it is difficult to judge what has been specifically agreed between Bessmertnykh and Baker. It is known, nowever,that in the first half of May Aleksandr Aleksandrovich [Bessmertnykh] is himself to go to the Near East. Information at our disposal enables us to draw the conclusion that Moscow's position on the question of the conference is gradually changing.

U.S. 'Legitimacy' in Mideast Viewed

LD2804191891 Moscow Radio Peace and Progress in Arabic 1400 GMT 28 Apr 91

[Commentary by "Colleague" Ahmad Abu Rashad in "The Soviet Union in the Eyes of an Arab" program]

[Excerpts] The Gulf war, or more precisely the military actions, have ended. These actions brought about a great destruction which hit the Iraqi economic, cultural, scientific, and military infrastructure. Thirty states led by the United States participated in these actions, in an international criminal antecedent which is unprecedented in the history of international relations.

At the time the war was bearing a destructive and savage character, the U.S. Administration was making promises with regard to the necessity to solve the Palestinian problem. After the end of the Gulf war, in a frank admission, U.S. President Bush linked the Gulf crisis with the Palestinian issue, which President Bush was denying, refuting, and was not admitting to in another attempt to quell the anger of the Arab masses with this war of aggression.

Thus, the front of the war of aggression had no sooner quietened down than the U.S. secretary of state rushed to the region with the aim of quelling the wrath of the Arab masses, giving as a label to his visit: seeking ways to the establishment of peace in the region. Yes, the cannons are silent, but the war has not come to an end yet; in my opinion it has, after the silence of guns, taken a more acute and more ferocious turn. Thus its results will be the most dangerous in contemporary Arab history. In reality, the armed war which was witnessed by the region, and despite all the destruction resulting from it, was nothing but a prelude to the beginning of the political war, which is most widespread, most comprehensive, and most dangerous, and some of this is being witnessed by the Arab region at the moment.

In my opinion, the political war which is taking place at the moment aims precisely at the elimination of the Palestinian issue. President Bush and Secretary of State James Baker aim at isolating the PLO and tightening the grip around its neck. Instead of solving the Palestinian question they want to discuss the Israeli problem through their call for solving the Arab-Israeli conflict with the concerned Arab states, leaving the Palestinian issue pending, then [agreeing] on it and aborting any just and permanent solution to this problem, given the opposition of the Zionist right to a solution of the Palestinian problem, and according to the UN resolutions.

The new value is called international legitimacy, the banner of which was raised by Washington and its ally, and under the aegis of which it waged the war of liberating Kuwait, called Desert storm, the consecration and consolidation of which should have been continued in order to impose it on Israel. [passage omitted]

The voices which are being raised now for the sake of solving the Palestinian issue and the Middle East question are I believe, in themselves suspicious operations. They aim solely at absorbing the sweeping anger of the Arab peoples among the states of the alliance led by President Bush. The reason is that if there were serious intentions to solve the Palestinian issue on the basis of international legitimacy—which they use as a pretext in order to destroy any Arab force so as to serve the Israeli, imperialist, and colonialist interests—the leaders of the alliance forces, led by the United States, would not have stood against linking the Palestinian issue and solving it on the basis of international legitimacy along with the question of Kuwait and the Gulf, which was one of the reasons for the big disaster which happened to the Arab world, whether in the political, economic, military, social or strategic spheres. [passage omitted]

The United States and the international community must consequently know that the polical action for solving the Palestinian problem cannot continue on the basis of the policy of hypocrisy, of double standards, and of talking with two tongues. [passage omitted]

Dear listeners, we have presented to you our weekly corner: "The Soviet Union in the Eyes of an Arab". In it, Colleague Ahmad Abu Rashad talked to us about international legitimacy and the Palestinian issue. We would like to inform you that his viewpoint is personal and may not coincide with the viewpoint of Radio Peace and Progress.

U.S. Plan for 'Bombing Attacks' Viewed

LD2804102591 Moscow World Service in English 0000 GMT 28 Apr 91

[Commentary by Valentin Zorin]

[Text] I'd like you to imagine a hypothetical situation. What would you say if you learned that the Moscow newspaper PRAVDA reported the Defense Department's plan to deliver missile and bombing attacks on thousands of installation in the United States? The plan was masterminded 10 years ago, lay in the archives and now the war department, after giving the final touches to it during the last few months, has submitted it for the consideration of the president, who is expected to sign it in the near future.

I think you'd take this report as a figment of some morbid imagination. Yet what is unbelievable in the

Soviet Union's case is a real fact for the United States. If you take the 19 April issue of the WASHINGTON POST newspaper, you'll read there all that I've just said, but pertaining to the United States. This issue of the WASHINGTON POST reports that between the end of last and the beginning of this year the Pentagon submitted for the President's endorsement the plan for delivering missile and bombing attacks on thousands of installation situated on the territory of the Soviet Union and East European countries.

According to the newspaper, the plan had been worked out by the Strategic Air Command of the U.S. Air Force, situated in Omaha, Nebraska State. While trying to analyze this strange plan prepared by Washington influential officials, I tried to follow their train of thought. They probably proceed from the assumption that the nuclear confrontation between the U.S. and the Soviet Union still exists.

This is why even if an agreement on reducing strategic offensive weapons and signed, still for a certain period of time the military will be required to submit plans for the use of nuclear weapons. Though illogical, this train of thought may prove to be extremely dangerous, and even provocative. An atmosphere of mutual trust between the two countries is still very flimsy and unstable. If it is to be made an irreversible reality, statesmanship, caution, restraint, and even elementary tact should be demonstrated.

It would be wrong here to reduce the entire matter to technical circumstances alone, ignoring political and emotional aspects. Washington officials should stop to think, to my mind, what the Soviet Union's reaction to the Pentagon plan may be. What was habitual in the cold war year looks odd now that the countries of the East and West try to look at one another as partners and not enemies. As the Paris declaration of the 22 points out, they are stretching a hand of friendship towards one another.

General Moiseyev To Visit Canada in May

LD2604174191 Moscow TASS in English 1446 GMT 26 Apr 91

[Text] Moscow April 26 TASS—It has been officially reported here today that Army General Mikhail Moiseyev, head of the General Staff of the Soviet Armed Forces and USSR first deputy defence minister, will pay an official visit to Canada in the first decade [as received] of May at the invitation of Chief of Staff of the Canadian National Defence John de Chasterlain.

China

Falin Discusses Jiang Visit With CPC Official

PM2604090191 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 24 Apr 91 Second Edition p 4

[TASS report under the general heading "Official Reports"]

[Text] On 23 April V.M. Falin, secretary of the CPSU Central Committee and chief of the CPSU Central Committee International Department, met with Li Shuzheng, candidate member of the CPC Central Committee and deputy chief of the CPC Central Committee International Ties Department. They discussed a number of topical questions of bilateral relations in the context of the preparation for the official visit to the Soviet Union by Jiang Zemin, general secretary of the CPC Central Committee.

V.L. Musatov, first deputy chief of the CPSU Central Committee International Department, and Yu Hongliang, PRC ambassador to the USSR, were present at the conversation.

Gidaspov Describes Talks With Jiang Zemin

OW2904084191 Moscow International Service in Mandarin 1000 GMT 27 Apr 91

[From the "Current Events and Commentaries" program]

[Text] Listeners, the delegation of the Leningrad Oblast Party Committee ended its visit to China on Friday [26 April]. The delegation was led by Boris Gidaspov, secretary of the CPSU Central Committee and the first secretary of the Leningrad Oblast Party Committee. After returning to Moscow from his trip, Gidaspov gave an interview to this station's special correspondents (Matinko) and (Galitov).

What are the purposes and outcomes of the delegation's visit to China? Gidaspov answered: The purposes of our visit are wide-ranging. In Shanghai and Beijing, we exchanged views on conditions of contacts between the two parties. The relations between the two parties in the future are a very important issue. Naturally, our discussions were not limited in the issue of training and educating cadres. We also had discussed economy. It should be pointed out that the meetings were of the highest level, as we had met with leaders of the party committees and mayors of Beijing and Shanghai, as well as with Jiang Zemin, general secretary of the CPC Central Committee. At every meeting, we pointed out that the relations between the organizations of the two parties and between leaders of our city and the city we were visiting were close in general. We firmly believed that the two parties and people of the two countries will have a wide field of activity in these issues. The significant tasks confronting people of the two countries can be tackled jointly. Gidaspov said: I believe that it is very important and that there are boundless prospects for maintaining long-term cooperation between the two countries' respective basic industrial sectors which have potential.

Please tell us your impressions of Jiang Zemin, general secretary of the CPC Central Committee, during your meeting with this statesman. Gidaspov said: Comrade Jiang Zemin and I had very long talks. The meeting was

originally scheduled to last for 30 to 50 minutes. However, our meeting actually was much longer and very fruitful. Comrade Jiang Zemin said he wished to visit Leningrad very much and intended to do so during his visit to the USSR in May. He wished to know lives of the party organizations and citizens in Leningrad, and to see their cultural (?activities). We have identical views on many pressing international issues and on current progress of the USSR and China.

Gidaspov said: I feel that Comrade Jiang Zemin is a person with firm beliefs. He knows what he needs and understands what he is doing. He understands his responsibility to his country. Such a sense of responsibility is displayed in his mode of thinking and specific opinions he proposed. I hope that Comrade Jiang Zemin's visit to the USSR will have an important impact on the development of Soviet-Chinese relations.

Alekseyev Comments on Current Sino-Soviet Ties

OW2904055691 Moscow International Service in Mandarin 1000 GMT 28 Apr 91

[Alekseyev commentary; from the "Current Events and Commentaries" program]

[Text] Listeners and friends, Beijing and Moscow have announced that Jiang Zemin, general secretary of the CPC Central Committee, will officially visit the Soviet Union from 15 to 19 May.

Our station observer Alekseyev said: This is the first visit by the top CPC leader to the Soviet Union in nearly 30 years. Whether in Moscow or Beijing, it is unanimously felt that the visit will become a new milestone in the development of good-neighborly relations between the Soviet Union and China.

What are the characteristics of current Sino-Soviet relations? I feel that the relationship between the two countries is stable and its prospects are good. In a recent press conference held in Beijing, Chinese Premier Li Peng stressed: Sino-Soviet relations will not return to those of the 1950's and 1960's, regardless of the circumstances. The Soviet Union also has ruled out this possibility.

I would like to comment briefly: During those periods, Sino-Soviet relations were mainly based on the incorrect theory of internationalism. This had actually restricted the initiative and damaged the sovereign rights of each side. It is very natural that this forced form of unanimity was unable to be sustained. The Soviet Union and China have learned from the past lessons. According to the common opinion of the two sides, the relationship of the two countries should be based on the Five Principles of Peaceful Coexistence. This means both countries should respect the other side's sovereignty and not interfere in each other's internal affairs.

Currently, the major principle of Moscow and Beijing is to strengthen good-neighborly relations and develop cooperation for mutual benefits in various spheres. The two sides attach great importance to solving issues remaining from the past, for example, the border issue. The Chinese delegation, headed by Vice Foreign Minister Tian Zengpei, arrived in Moscow on 25 April to continue talks on the border issue. The results of the talks were fruitful. For instance, the two sides have agreed on 90 percent of the alignment of the boundary line.

The Soviet Union is very interested in cooperating with China in the international arena. However, the kind of cooperation I am talking about here is not merely that which exists between strategic partners. Each side is pursuing a totally independent foreign policy. Whether in Moscow or Beijing, it is unanimously felt that in this respect, their major mission is to guarantee and maintain peace. This opens the possibility for the development of cooperation for mutual benefits between the two sides.

Northeast Asia

No Tae-u Confirms Agreement To Sign Treaty

SK2804050691 Moscow International Service in Korean 1100 GMT 24 Apr 91

[From "Asian News" under the "Focus on Asia" program]

[Text] ROK President No Tae-u confirmed that he supports the plan to sign a treaty on good-neighborly relations and cooperation with the Soviet Union. An agreement to start drafting this treaty, designed to provide a reliable legal basis for developing Soviet-ROK relations in the future, was reached during a meeting between President No Tae-u and Soviet President Gorbachev on Cheju Island.

Meanwhile, Choe Chang-yun, minister of the ROK Information Agency, described this meeting as a historic breakthrough. The meeting decided to cooperate in improving (?East-West) relations in the future and bringing an end to the outdated cold war. Referring to the prospects of economic cooperation between the ROK and the Soviet Union, Choe Chang-yun said that the volume of trade between the two countries was almost $600 million in 1989 and that it will reach $1.5 billion this year. The volume of trade may increase to $10 billion a year in the mid-1990's.

Commentator Views PRC-ROK Relations

SK2604130591 Moscow International Service in Korean 1330 GMT 24 Apr 91

[Commentary by station commentator Aleksey Nikolayev from "Today's World" program]

[Text] The ROK paper TONG-A ILBO, quoting remarks from a high-ranking spokesman for the Seoul administration, carried an article saying that the ROK Government, taking into consideration the outcome of the USSR-ROK summit talks, has decided to make every

diplomatic effort to rapidly establish diplomatic ties with Beijing. The ROK paper pointed out that Seoul already wanted to establish them this fall. Station commentator Aleksey Nikolayev points out that he cannot now say whether the hope to normalize relations with Beijing will be realized in the near future or not. This trend of normalized ties has just recently developed. The ROK and the People's Republic of China already took their first steps in this new direction long ago. Among them, the most important step recently is an exchange of trade missions. Among the staff members, many are diplomats. The ROK has honestly said that it will utilize the opening of the trade representative's missin in Beijing to promote the development of diplomatic relations. So to speak, Seoul and Beijing, through their trade representatives, will likely closely contact each other.

What will happen in the future ? It will be clear to some extent after the visit by Li Peng, premier of the Chinese State Council, to Pyongyang in early May.

In recent days, the DPRK leadership's sharp reaction to the USSR-ROK summit talks clearly shows that Pyongyang feels disadvantages in the outcome of Seoul's northern diplomacy. This policy has the task of having the PRC officially recognize the ROK.

In talking about Beijing, it has shown its faithfulness in its traditional relations with the DPRK many times. On the other hand, why does it not consider the possibility of normalizing relations with the ROK at the same time? Judging from evidence, the appearance of a PRC Embassy in Seoul will not harm anybody. Rather, the situation on the Korean Peninsula will have a new element and will be more flexible.

It can be said, at the same time, that the improvement of relations between the United States and the DPRK and between the DPRK and Japan will be activated. The USSR-ROK summit talks have injected a vigor into the development of their relations. Anyway, in Beijing, judging from this, there have been affirmative reactions to such changes. For example, at the beginning of this week, a spokesman for the PRC Ministry of Foreign Affairs welcomed the visit by President Gorbachev to the ROK. In an interview with KYODO news service, he expressed his opinion that relations between the USSR and the ROK will contribute to easing tension on the Korean Peninsula.

Bessmertnykh, DPRK Ambassador Confer

PM2604081991 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 24 Apr 91 Second Edition p 5

[TASS report: "Ambassador Received"]

[Text] On 23 April, USSR Foreign Minister A.A. Bessmertnykh received Son Song-pil, DPRK ambassador to the USSR. During the conversation they discussed questions of the further development of Soviet-Korean relations and the situation on the Korean peninsula.

A.A. Bessmertnykh informed the ambassador about the main results of the USSR president's meeting with the president of the ROK and also about the Soviet-Japanese summit talks.

Trade Agreement Signed With DPRK

LD2804122491 Moscow TASS in English 1219 GMT 28 Apr 91

[By TASS correspondent Ivan Zakharchenko]

[Text] Pyongyang April 28 TASS—The Soviet Union and North Korea signed an intergovernment agreement on trade and economic cooperation for 1991 here today, designed to expand bilateral relations in conditions of market reforms.

The document envisages the transition to payments in convertible currency at world prices.

North Korea will sell machinery, equipment, zinc, rolled stock, food and consumer goods to the Soviet Union in return for oil, coal, machinery, equipment, raw materials and other goods.

The two countries will also expand industrial cooperation, including in the light industry.

The sides specially agreed on a list of goods and services North Korea will supply to the Soviet Union to service its debt.

This year, North Korea is expected to pay about 500 million roubles of the total debt estimated at about 2.6 billion roubles.

Southeast Asia & Pacific

Bessmertnykh Meets With Cambodian Counterpart

PM2604145991 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 25 Apr 91 Union Edition p 4

[TASS report under the general heading: "Talks Held"]

[Text] USSR Foreign Minister A.A. Bessmertnykh had talks in Moscow 23 April with Cambodian Foreign Minister Hor Namhong, who has arrived in our country on a working visit at the invitation of the Soviet Government.

The ministers exchanged information on the course of perestroyka in the USSR and the socioeconomic transformations in the State of Cambodia. They discussed the state of and prospects for bilateral cooperation in the trade and economic sphere.

During their discussion of pressing international problems they focused their attention on a Cambodia settlement. The ministers confirmed both countries' course of securing a most speedy settlement of the conflict. This process must be implemented strictly in accordance with the UN Charter, respecting the Cambodian people's

sovereignty, legitimate interests, and right to free self-determination and providing guarantees that the genocide regime will not be restored. It was stressed that the package of draft documents prepared by the five permanent members of the UN Security Council and the cochairmen of the Paris International Conference on Cambodia represents a real foundation for an all-embracing resolution of the Cambodia question by political means.

The Soviet side welcomed the Cambodian Government's readiness to take a constructive part in the scheduled meeting in Jakarta involving the cochairmen of the Paris International Conference and the members of Cambodia's Supreme National Council.

A.A. Bessmertnykh and Hor Namhong voiced serious concern in connection with the continuing military operations and vigorously supported the appeal from the cochairmen of the Paris International Conference and the UN secretary general calling for a voluntary cease-fire starting 1 May this year. They noted the pressing need for the question of introducing a moratorium on foreign military shipments to all Cambodian sides to be resolved as soon as possible, as a highly important stage in the attainment of an all-embracing settlement.

Commentary on Gorbachev Asian Security Proposal

OW2704144991 Moscow in Japanese to Japan 1200 GMT 18 Apr 91

[Kalinin commentary]

[Text] Soviet President Gorbachev delivered a speech at the Japanese Diet on 17 April and in the speech referred to the issue of security in the Asian and Pacific region. Regarding it, military commentator Kalinin of Moscow Radio commented as follows:

With regard to the question of strengthening security and easing military tensions in the Asian and Pacific region, about which President Gorbachev spoke in his speech, I would like to note three basic points.

First is the need to remove the idea that there is an enemy. I would like you to recall that the Soviet Union and the United States have already made it clear that they will no longer regard each other as the enemy, not only in Europe but also in Asia.

The next point is Soviet-Japanese relations. As President Gorbachev pointed out, even in the Cold War days, the Soviet Union and Japan never raised the question of exercising force on each other. The present-day situation makes the raising of such a question even more inappropriate. It is no coincidence that President Gorbachev formally declared that the scenario of the Soviet Union attacking Japan could never happen.

In this connection there is another important point in the President's speech. This is that the Soviet military policy on Japan and other countries in the Asian and Pacific region is based on a new military doctrine—the doctrine which stands on the principle of the military being exclusively for defensive purposes. There are many examples showing this. The abolition of 590 nuclear missiles in the Soviet Union's Asian area carried out in accordance with the INF abolition treaty, will be completed in the next two months.

In the past almost four years, the Soviet Union has not increased the number of nuclear launchers in its Asian area. In the Far East including the Soviet area, the unilateral reduction of Soviet troops has been implemented. And that is not all. President Gorbachev said that he intends to continues to lower the level of the Soviet military presence in the Asian and Pacific region, even though the scope of the future reduction and the duration, over which it will be carried out, have not been made clear.

But what I want to emphasize is that in many respects this process will depend on [words indistinct] reciprocity of other countries in the Asian and Pacific region. This reciprocity in efforts for the security of Asia is a particularly important point. And this is the third point.

The point is that existing problems cannot be resolved by one country alone. Bilateral contacts need to be promoted into multiple contacts. Besides, this matter cannot be solved by taking the experiences of Europe nor by creating a cooperative organization by law.

I think that it should be completely acceptable to discuss various issues for the first time—if this prevents common dangers in a timely manner. [word indistinct] that can be cited here are various. The president proposed beginning talks among the three nations of the Soviet Union, Japan, and the United States. He also presented the idea of holding talks among five nations—the Soviet Union, the United States, China, India, and Japan. He also iterated his proposal on holding talks among foreign ministers of all nations in the Asian and Pacific region to discuss security in 1993.

I would like to note here that the Soviet Union is taking initiatives, but of course, the Soviet Union has no intention of pushing this on others. The Soviet Union is willing to give a constructive review of pertinent proposals of all nations concerned. As President Gorbachev said in a welcome dinner hosted by [words indistinct], the cold war is over. The time to work and build a house of trust and sincere neighborliness might have arrived.

Commentary Views Asia-Pacific Policy

LD2604094891 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1312 GMT 25 Apr 91

[By TASS political observer Askold Biryukov]

[Excerpt] Moscow, 25 Apr (TASS)—During talks with ROK Foreign Minister Yi Sang-ok, Japanese Foreign

Minister Taro Nakayama demonstrated a negative attitude to the proposals on ensuring security and confidence-building measures in the Asia-Pacific region set forth in Tokyo by the USSR president recently. According to the minister, they do not take into account the specific nature and complexity of the situation in the region as being different from the situation in Europe. The region's problems should be solved separately from one another, starting with the tension in the Korean peninsula, the territorial dispute between Japan and the USSR about four islands, and the Cambodian conflict, he said. The minister's ideas boil down to the fact that the Asia-Pacific region "is not ripe yet" for implementing the proposals put forward by the Soviet Union.

I am not going to argue with the minister about the fact that the situation in Europe and that in the Asia-Pacific region differ substantially. This is indeed so, and to apply the European blueprint to this region would be not only unrealistic but also unreasonable. But even leaving Europe aside, is it reasonable to distance oneself from the purposes of Soviet proposals? Let us recall the recent events in the Persian Gulf, to where Japan is now sending minesweepers. This armed conflict, in my view, has persuaded many people that regional security structures in today's situation are especially necessary. The situation in the region remains quite volatile. The configuration of security is changing, and in these conditions the need to have an instrument capable of putting out possible dangerous situations is obvious.

The Soviet Union is reducing its armed forces and military presence in the Asia-Pacific region. The United States, too, intends to carry out certain reductions. On the other hand, a striving toward building up arms, which could turn into another round of military rivalry, is noticeable in individual countries in the region. Various multilateral alliances, which give rise to new apprehensions, are being discussed. How are they to be removed? How to solve other problems which are already acquiring global importance today?

If one proceeds along the path of solving one problem after the other, we will hardly go very far. It is not excluded that instead of one problem another will arise and there will be no end to them. As the USSR president's proposals show, the Soviet Union has a flexible enough position on this account. We propose two-, three-, five-sided, and multilateral consultations. There is a wide choice, as the saying goes. And Moscow is not proposing to break the structures that have already taken shape of what it is sometimes suspected. Especially as these structures ensure stability, in a certain sense. But, naturally, we, and, after all, not we alone, would like, perhaps, that this stability should be in the interests of all the countries in the region. [passage omitted]

Near East & South Asia

Bessmertnykh on 'Opportunity' for Mideast Peace

LD2804143591 Berlin ADN in German 1349 GMT 28 Apr 91

[Text] Berlin (ADN)—"If we and the Americans are of the opinion that there is now a chance for a Middle East settlement, then maximum use must be made of that opportunity," Soviet Foreign Minister Aleksandr Bessmertnykh said in an exclusive interview with "NEUES DEUTSCHLAND" (Monday edition).

Failure to use this chance contained the danger of an incalculable development of events. All Arab countries involved in the conlfict, Israel, and the Palestinians should take part in a Middle East conference at the start of the process of settlement. The USSR, the United States, the United Nations, and the EC should participate. The settlement would surely stretch over several years, the foreign minister said. A comprehensive international conference could be the culmination of this process.

According to Bessmertnykh the Soviet Union is moving toward a resumption of diplomatic relations with Israel, but accepted this as a precondition for taking over as co-chair for the Middle East conference. In 1973 the USSR had been co-chair of the Geneva Middle East conference without maintaining diplomatic relations with Israel.

(An edited version of the interview was prereleased to ADN.)

Commentary on Palestinian Central Council Session

LD2604205691 Moscow International Service in Arabic 1500 GMT 26 Apr 91

[Commentary by (Ivan Menshikov), NOVOSTI special correspndent in Tunis]

[Excerpts] The rumors about the death of the PLO are exaggerated. This is a legitimate conclusion as a result of analysis of the outcome of the Palestinian Central Council session held here.

Jamil Hilal, an official in the PLO Information Department, said in a discussion with me: During our struggle we have faced more complex problems. [passage omitted]

As far as Palestinian representation is concerned, the PLO believes it is preferable in the current stage that the Organization form an independent delegation in order to participate in the conference [not further specified]. At the same time, it did not consider unlikely the possibility of Palestinian participation in a joint Arab delegation.

PLO official Jamil Hilal told me that the project of forming a Palestinian-Jordian delegation has not been discussed by the PLO leadership yet. The discussions in the Central Council session focused on issues of internal events and the activity of the Palestinian resistance. A decision was adopted with regard to continuing the uprising. It was also decided to activate the process of widening democracy in the PLO and the command bodies of the uprising, in which all active political forces—inside or outside the occupied territories—must

be represented. They must naturally adhere in their activity to the Central Council's resolutions.

I would like to mention the determination of the PLO to continue active dialogue with the Soviet Union and rely, as in the past, on its support and help in the struggle for achieving the national rights of the Palestinian people. For this reason, a delegation from the PLO Executive Committee paid a visit to Moscow immediately after the end of the Central Council session and met Soviet Foreign Minister Aleksandr Bessmertnykh.

Israeli Diplomat on Mideast Issues, Soviet Ties

LD2704224491 Moscow Central Television First Program Network in Russian 1515 GMT 27 Apr 91

[Interview with Mr. Levin, Israeli general consul in Moscow, by Nikolay Shishlin in studio; date not given; from the "International Panorama" program presented by Nikolay Shishlin—recorded]

[Text] [Shishlin] U.S. Secretary of State James Baker visited our country. He had thorough talks with USSR Foreign Minister Aleksandr Bessmertnykh in Kislovodsk. Baker had interrupted his trip to the Near East, his third after the war in the Gulf. Admittedly, U.S. diplomacy is enviably active, something which feels like a reproach to our diplomats.

You know what was discussed in Kislovodsk. Since all attention was on the affairs in the Near East, that was naturally the subject that dominated the talks, though disarmament issues and problems connected with a possible USSR-United States summit were also discussed. I believe that the actual level of activity of U.S. complex diplomacy in the Near East—after all, the talks being held there are complex, and the talks in Syria and in other countries were also complex—is also inciting, I believe, the USSR to increase its own level of diplomatic activity. For all our preoccupation with our domestic affairs, we must take up an initiating position in the international scene, and in the Near East region. I think that this will soon be rectified. What I now have in mind is not just the fact that our representatives are now in Kuwait negotiating the use of our machinery, our people and our possibilities to put out the fires in Kuwait, I also mean the possibility of holding contacts at a very high level with Near East countries. This needs to be done. This is serious.

No so long ago before I was due to go on the air in this program, I had an opportunity to have a chat with Mr. Levin, general consul of Israel in Moscow. I would like to offer you a brief interview with the General Consul of Israel.

[Shishlin] [video shows Shishlin and Levin in the studio] Mr. Levin, my first question to you is this: How do people in Israel view the meeting, the first meeting between the Soviet prime minister and the prime minister of your country?

[Levin] They have generally taken a very positive view of it, because the meeting was unprecedented. That was indeed the first contact at the top level—or almost at the top level—at which the problems crucial to both countries, generally concerning relations between the two countries Near East issues, were discussed. That was a very fruitful conversation—a conversation which was held in a very good atmosphere. It was very friendly, open, and frank. Statement were then made. Everything went very well. For our part at any rate, we have been very pleased with it.

[Shishlin] You have just mentioned discussion of the Near East problem. The Soviet press covers the Arab position rather well. The U.S. position has been covered fairly well, too. The position of your country, however, has not been covered as generously. Could you outline in brief Israel's ideas about the way the Near East problem can be settled?

[Levin] I agree that you in the USSR have not got a very good idea of our position. I would like to briefly say this: I think there are two provisions here which simply require discussion. I have in mind two key issues facing us. The first issue is that the state of war between us and all Arab countries, and everything which ensues from this state of war, should be lifted. For instance, the question of economic boycott from which my country is suffering in an economic sense. The second point is that we must establish contacts between us and Palestinain Arabs who live either on our teritories or in this region. This question is an age-old one, and is connected with many others. There was an exchange of the population at one time, namely during the 1948 war. This question requires resolution, too. It must be definitely resolved.

[Shishlin] I understand that the time has come to normalize relations between the USSR and Israel. I have in mind the full restoration of diplomatic relations and development of fully-fledged ties between our two countries. What does the current state of Soviet-Israeli relations look like? Have they become broader in recent years?

[Levin] Yes, one can say and it would only be fair—and not only fair but also essential in this case—to restore full diplomatic relations, since that would help the USSR to take part in the capacity of an honest intermediary in establishing peace in the Near East. We are very concerned that the USSR must take part in this process and exercise its well-known influence on Arab countries and that entire region.

I believe, we believe, therefore, that it is essential to go back to that issue and establish relations. I can say in conclusion that much to our satisfaction, despite the fact that we have not got full diplomatic relations, our relations have generally been at a much higher and broader level than they were in all those years before 1967.

[Shishlin] Many thanks, Mr. Levin, for this interview.

[Levin] Thank you very much.

East Europe

Issue of Hungary-Based Nuclear Arms Considered

LD2804123391 Moscow All-Union Radio Mayak Network in Russian 0730 GMT 28 Apr 91

[Text] The USSR Defense Ministry published a statement this week confirming that nuclear weapons had for several years been at the disposal of the southern group of Soviet forces stationed on Hungarian soil. This admission followed a clamorous campaign in the Hungarian press, started by NEPSZABADSAG. Here is a report by Sergey Shalygin, our Budapest correspondent.

[Shalygin] Last Monday the newspaper carried an interview with Karoly Grosz, former prime minister of the Hunagrian People's Republic. He recalled that he had seen a document signed by Janos Kadar agreeing to the stationing of Soviet nuclear warheads in the territory of Hungary. During his first official visit to Moscow, Karoly Grosz requested the Soviet leadership to withdraw the nuclear weapons there. A few months later this was done. True, Miklos Nemeth, who succeeded Grosz as head of governemnt, claims that the Soviet Union was fulfilling his request and not the promise given his predecessor.

However, this verbal skirmish in the struggle to be the first in no way alters the fact that Hungary, as a country on whose territory nuclear weapons were sited, had naturally been a target for NATO missiles and bombers equipped with armaments to neutralize weapons of mass destruction. Even finding out about this after the event, any Hungarian will sigh with relief when he calls to mind the withdrawal of Soviet troops from his country, which is nearing completion.

Incidentaly, Hungarian specialists and my journalistic colleagues have examined the presumed nuclear weapons storage facilities which have been given up. It has been ascertained that there has been no radiation there previously or now.

The only thing that remains unknown is when these weapons might have been inroduced into the country. One of the heroes of the 1956 revolution, Lieutenant General Bela Kiraly, who is now a deputy of Hungary's state assembly, considers that 35 years ago the Soviet troops did not want to leave the country precisely because they would thereby have to be deprived of one of the locations for the forward basing of nuclear weapons in Europe. But that is a thing of the past. At the present time Bela Kiraly expresses some perplexity over why Karoly Grosz, a former leader of the Socialist Workers' Party and the government, needed to make a fact that was known to the whole world the subject of such broad discussion. The country will derive no benefit from this, the general stressed. We are keeping an open door to the West, but this does not mean that we are closing it to the East.

Hungary Suspends Medicine Delivery to USSR

PM2604140591 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 20 Apr 91 Union Edition p 6

[B. Rodionov report: "Medicines Worth $100 Million Are Not Being Sent to the USSR Because There Is No Money To Pay for Them"]

[Text] At the end of last year IZVESTIYA reported that against a background of major complications in Soviet-Hungarian trade, the question of deliveries of medicines to the USSR in 1991 looks favorable. Yet now that the first quarter is behind us, deliveries from Hungary have been completely suspended.

"But this is not the fault of the Hungarian side," J. Ambrus, Hungarian Republic trade representative in Moscow, makes clear immediately. "Contracts worth $407 million for the current year between the Soviet "Medeksport" and our "Medimpex" were concluded in good time. One-fourth of the medicines, or the amount that was designated for delivery in the first quarter, has been manufactured and is lying in Hungarian warehouses, since "Medeksport" is not paying up and blaming the USSR Bank for Foreign Economic Activity. Of course, we understand the USSR's financial difficulties, but according to the intergovernmental agreement the medicines are included in the so-called indicative lists whereby the governments of both countries give certain guarantees if commercial contracts are concluded. The Hungarian side is fulfilling its commitments, having already paid $270 million for Soviet goods which were put on the indicative lists. In the meantime payment to the value of 40 million [currency unit unspecified] has been made by the Soviet side, but we have received nothing for the medicines."

"Enterprises which for many years specialized in deliveries to the USSR of ko-shpa [as transliterated], kavinton [as transliterated], and other original Hungarian medicines are literally on the threshold of bankruptcy," comments L. Timar, chief of the Hungarian Republic Ministry of International Economic Relations main administration. "If this goes on, we shall have to withdraw from the Soviet market, and this is neither in our interests nor yours. Mutual commitment was recently reaffirmed at a meeting between the general directors of Hungarian pharmaceutical enterprises and the USSR health service minister..."

"We are not sitting idle, we are looking for partners at the local level," adds L. Farkas, director of "Medimpex" Moscow office, "but needless to say, we cannot resolve the problem unaided."

For my own part I should add that deliveries of medicines to the Soviet Union from other countries are also threatened. But however difficult the current foreign

exchange situation, payment for indispensable medicines should be given preferential status.

'Delicate Questions' Jeopardize Romanian Ties

PM2904105191 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 25 Apr 91 First Edition p 5

[V. Rusnak article: "Are Claims Appropriate? Preserving the Tradition of Good-Neighborliness Between the USSR and Romania"]

[Text] Reaction in Romania to the recent first working visit to the USSR of President I. Iliescu was equivocal. The official ROMPRESS agency noted the great political significance of the treaty that was signed in Moscow, and the newspaper ADEVARUL, which is close to government circles, reported on the solid basis that had been established for the multilateral development of cooperation with the Soviet Union, including cooperation with "our brethren beyond the Prut." The opposition press called this document "an unprecedented national shame," the essence of which, opines the purportedly independent ROMANIA LIBERA, is the president's acceptance on behalf of 23 million Romanians that they "have no territorial claims with regard to Bessarabia, Northern Bukovina, and Zmeinyy Island."

As we know, hasty judgments certainly do not always turn out to be right. Staying on the ground of objective reality, it is impossible to deny the fact that the Cooperation, Good-Neighborliness, and Friendship Treaty signed 5 April translates Soviet-Romanian relations into norms that are accepted in international practice. They have already been confirmed by our country in a series of bilateral treaties with France, Germany, Italy, Spain, and other countries. This is the first document of its kind that has been signed with our neighbors in Eastern Europe, and at the same time it is a practical step in realizing the ideas of the Paris Charter regarding a new peaceful European order.

There is another important point. While clearing away the "obstructions" which in N. Ceausescu's time piled up aplenty owing to fundamental differences on questions of democratization, glasnost, humanitarian and economic ties, and human contacts, we are not only keeping everything of value from our past relations but are taking them to a new level, to a phase of real mutual interest.

It is not just objective factors like geographical proximity, complementary economic systems, similar problems in transferring to the market, and the structure and potential of communications that favor the affirmation of a new type of partnership, but also subjective factors. We are talking about traditions of good-neighborliness, the absence of conflicts which aggravate our relations like those in Hungary in 1956 and Czechoslovakia in 1968, the absence of problems regarding Soviet troops (the last Soviet soldier quit Romanian territory in 1958), and the political will of the leadership of our countries to take the path of renewal. Therefore the provision written into the new treaty saying that whatever the circumstances we shall regard each other as friendly states is underpinned by a solid foundation and is not directed against any third country.

Nevertheless, one cannot help noticing that new and, as I. Iliescu put it, "delicate" points have appeared on the agenda of Soviet-Romanian relations. This is evidenced in particular by a number of ideas aired at the Romanian president's concluding press conference in Moscow.

For example, in answer to a question about the future ties and "unification inclinations" of Romania and Moldova, he said bluntly that "two Romanian governments exist," between which relations will develop "on the basis of strict observance of the principles of state sovereignty and the right of peoples to self-determination." Developing this idea, the Romanian leader stressed that in the context of observing principles of justice "there are examples of all problems, including those regarding borders, being resolved by peaceful means; there is scope for any solution."

It only remains for us to guess what "example" of a solution is being talked about here: the "two Germanies" question in 1990, the "Bessarabian" question in 1918, or some other example. The French newspaper LE FIGARO put the question to Prime Minister P. Roman point-blank: Would there come a day when Moldavia would become Romanian? The answer was just as direct: "But Moldavia is Romanian... It does not form part of the Romanian state. It is a sovereign republic, maybe even independent. The Soviet-Romanian treaty clearly mentions the right of each of our republics to support the democratic evolution of its neighbor."

However, it was in this context that the Romanian side raised the question of Zmeinyy Island, and according to I. Iliescu the question "remains open." The island is located not far from the mouth of the Danube, approximately equidistant between our countries, and it belongs to the Soviet Union, as confirmed by a protocol dated 23 May 1948.

In whatever diplomatic form this issue is dressed up, and whatever historical, emotional, or other arguments one appeals to, everything essentially boils down to one thing—to a formulation of the problem of territorial repartition. Through our own bitter experience of recent years, we are sure that we know where passions can lead once they are aroused by carving up territory in our troubled times.

Peace and stability in this region, which is traditionally complex in terms of its political, ethnic and other "junctions," can only be guaranteed by genuine good-neighborliness and cooperation. The Soviet Union is prepared for this and is sure that here, along this path, the historical and cultural traditions and ethnic ties which are able to serve as a natural bridge to agreement are being most fully realized.

And one last point. The matter of the gold reserve handed over by the Romanian government "for safekeeping" to the Russian Tsarist government in December 1916 following the capture of Bucharest by German and Austrian troops and the threatened occupation of other regions of the country. According to the magazine LIFE IN ROMANIA (1991, No 1, p 25), the reserve is estimated at 321.58 million gold lei (on the exchange rate at the time this was equivalent to slightly over 91 tonnes of gold or approximately 120 million gold rubles).

I do not wish to resort to analogy, but all the same I will remind readers that N. Ceausescu raised precisely this question—the return of national wealth—during his first official visit to the USSR as head of the Romanian party and government delegation in September 1965. At that time, as in December 1967 when the question was raised yet again, the answer was as follows: The Soviet side considers the matter closed forever and removed from the agenda and no longer has any intention of reconsidering it, because when it is raised it inevitably brings in its wake a number of countervailing problems relating both to World War I and the actions of Romanian occupying troops on the territory of the Soviet Union during World War II, and in no way serves the cause of strengthening friendship between our peoples.

Archive documents were cited in this matter which testify that Romania should have paid Russia about 300 million gold rubles, equivalent to 232 tonnes of gold, for delivery of various military equipment in accordance with treaties and conventions of 1916-1917, and also for equipment seized and requisitioned by Romanian troops when the Russian army was demobilized. These sources claim that the Tsarist government demanded Romania's gold reserve as security for the payment of the debt...

Other figures were also cited, specifically $300 million which Romania should have paid to the USSR in reparations after World War II, and which, according to the state committee's estimate, comprised just one-fifth of the actual damage caused by the Romanian occupation. Even this sum was later reduced by $73.2 million, and Romania was freely given 135 million rubles from the total sum of 338 million transfer rubles that made up the Soviet stake in Soviet-Romanian joint-stock companies.

There was also another, moral side to the question. When he arrived in the city of Beltsy 17 July 1941, Marshal I. Antonescu, who today in both Romania and Moldavia is accorded the halo of "martyr and national hero" by certain forces, ordered: "The slightest resistance from the population is to be punished by shooting. The names of those who are shot will be published... Checks are to be made on the population of Bessarabia; suspects and those who speak out against us are to be eliminated..." This order cost the lives of 493,000 Soviet citizens, 64,000 of whom were killed and made to suffer in Moldavia...

Facts, as they say, are stubborn things. Today at least six members of that Romanian delegation from September 1965 are alive and well. They are I.G. Maurer, former chairman of the Council of Ministers; his two first deputies G. Apostol and A. Birladeanu (now chairman of the Romanian Senate); P. Niculescu-Mizil and M. Manescu (sentenced to life imprisonment), both secretaries of the Romanian Communist Party Central Committee; and C. Manescu, member of the Romanian Communist Party Central Committee and foreign minister, (now head of the Romanian parliament's international affairs committee).

At the summit meeting in Moscow a declaration was made of the intention to stick to a carefully considered, sensible position that takes into account today's political realities on all questions of Soviet-Romanian relations, and particularly on the so-called "delicate questions." And this, in the words of I. Iliescu, "means not creating difficulties for each other; on the contrary, it means pooling efforts to overcome difficulties by rejecting extremism of any kind."

Golden words indeed...

West Europe

Council of Europe Support for Reforms Noted

LD2604152291 Moscow TASS in English 1346 GMT 26 Apr 91

[By TASS news analyst Albert Balebanov]

[Text] Moscow April 26 TASS—The sessions of the Council of Europe governing bodies—the Parliamentary Assembly and the Committee of Ministers—have forcefully demonstrated that this major regional organisation is firmly determined to help implement the specific provisions of the historic charter for a new Europe.

It seems that priority here is given to fostering multifarious cooperation between the western and eastern parts of the European continent, including with the Soviet Union. The Committee of Ministers of the Council of Europe passed a decision to help develop and implement programmes of aid and cooperation with the USSR.

The Council of Europe also pledged to act within the frameworks of new CSCE structures for the benefit of building a common Europe home. At issue are programmes of aid in legal and social spheres and also in the field of the operation of local governing bodies.

The Council of Europe decided to make its contribution to preparing the CSCE conference on the human dimension, which is scheduled to take place in Moscow. The USSR was invited to take part as an observer in numerous commissions of the Council of Europe parliamentary assembly.

The Council of Europe member-countries' aspirations to help perestroika in the USSR is undoubtedly sincere and

is prompted by the severe difficulties which reforms in the USSR have encountered. The threat looming over reforms is real and the consequences of the possible destabilisation of the situation are so serious that West European leaders, who are aware of this, are ready to extend a hand of solidarity to our country.

West German Chancellor Helmut Kohl has recently urged the west to lend support to President Mikhail Gorbachev in his efforts to establish new state structures based on the principles of federalism in the country and carry through economic reforms leading to the creation of a market economy.

Spanish Foreign Minister Francisco Fernandez Ordonez believes that the Council of Europe's cooperation with the USSR will help our country pursue the policy of democratic reforms ensuring respect for human rights.

The Council of Europe, which became the first European regional organisation to accept in its ranks East European states, is adapted better than any other international organisation to play a key role in implementing the goals and tasks of the CSCE process. The outlines of a single economic, legal and ecological space are already coming into focus and progress has been made on disarmament issues and in the quest for ways to create new common European security structures.

It is a fact that European states belong to differing social systems. Differences among states cannot be removed. Therefore, regional organisations, including the Council of Europe, will have to proceed from the recognition of these circumstances. In this case, the all-important prerequisite will be ensured for a normal development of the European process, which aims to overcome the division of Europe by building a common European home.

Supreme Soviet

USSR Supreme Soviet Proceedings 25 Apr

LD2504221891

[Editorial Report] Moscow Central Television Second Program Network in Russian at 1930 GMT on 25 April carries a 42-minute "At the USSR Supreme Soviet Session" program of recorded excerpts of the proceedings of the USSR Supreme Soviet session in the Kremlin in Moscow on 25 April.

The announcer begins by saying that the two chambers of the Supreme Soviet met separately today.

At 1931 GMT, Gennadiy Kiselev, head of the parliamentary commission investigating the situation in Moldova, reads a statement to the Council of Nationalities on the commission's visit to that republic. He goes on to cite an interview given by Moldovan President Mircha Snegur, in which Snegur claims that the Dnestr republics are pseudo-republics backed by Moscow to impede Moldova's attainment of its rights.

Deputy Boris Palagnyuk responds to Kiselev's statement, saying that the Dnestr people want to live in peace.

At 1940 GMT, Rafik Nishanov, chairman of the Council of Nationalities, says that the aim is the attainment of accord, not the creation of new states. He adds that all parties—the Kishinev parliament, the Gagauz, and the Dnestr region—are to blame for the crisis.

Deputy Pashaly says people want to be in charge of their own destinies and have equal rights.

Marshal of the Soviet Union Sergey Akhromeyev says he knows something about the situation in the republic. He asserts that the draft decision should be adopted. It will ease the situation.

At 1947 GMT Deputy Kostishin says there was good reason for the creation of the Dnestr republic: it was in response to Kishinev's separatist moves.

Deputy Pupkevich says that no one is entitled to violate human rights.

At 1952 GMT Deputy Pilnikov says that yesterday's statement about most favored republic status will focus minds. In discussions with the Moldovan leaders, the delegation asked about human rights, he states.

Deputy Tarazevich says that people in Moldova blame the center, but this is not justified.

Deputy Kanarovskaya says democracy should protect the rights of all ethnic groups.

At 2001 GMT Deputy Doga says that we have to be patient in Moldova: perestroyka gave people freedom, but the law is the only argument.

Nishanov says that the Moldovan authorities have failed to accept proposals from the Supreme Soviet, but the work being done with the republics gives every opportunity to stay in the union, while retaining independence.

At 2006 GMT Deputy Auyelbekov reports on a fact-finding mission to the disputed area on the border of Kyrgyzstan and Tajikistan.

The announcer says that Kyrgyz and Tajik views were then expressed. Nishanov called for calm dialogue, and a decision was passed on the results of the debate. There will be a joint session tomorrow, the announcer concludes. The program ends at 2012 GMT.

Legislature Discusses Moldova 25 Apr

LD2504210391 Moscow All-Union Radio First Program Radio-1 Network in Russian 1635 GMT 25 Apr 91

[From the "Parliamentary Diary" program]

[Excerpts] [Announcer Leonid Lazarevich] A sitting of the Soviet of Nationalities opened in the Kremlin at midday. An acute, painful problem was discussed there: the situation in the Republic of Moldova. On the Supreme Soviet's agenda, this point was worded as follows: on ways of achieving accord and normalizing the sitaution in the Republic of Moldova. Indeed, it is hard to call the situation there normal. Therefore, the Supreme Soviet formed a special working group and dispatched it to study the situation. It was with a report by its leader, Gennadiy Nikolayevich Kiselev, that the discussion of this issue began:

[Begin Kiselev recording] The conclusion to which our group came is depressing. The main provisions of the USSR president's decree of 22 December last year on the situation in the Republic of Moldova have not been fulfilled. I have to note that the main issues remain unresolved; and, particularly recently, constructive steps to implement the presidential decree and consolidate the various political forces in the republic have not been taken. For example, the conciliatory commission of the republic's Supreme Soviet has stopped working. To begin with, a list of issues which it was supposed to examine was adopted, but then the majority unilaterally refused to examine a number of those issues.

Also, the unconstitutional authorities in the Dnestr region and in the south of the republic have resumed their activity. The argument for this is that the republic's leadership and Supreme Soviet are ignoring the main provisions and demands of the USSR president's decree.

Perhaps there should have been some kind of impetus from the center. Perhaps they might have changed the state of affairs somehow. In our view, comrades, the involvement of union bodies in normalizing the situation is necessary, all the same. What is going on, for example? Both sides are accusing each other of not having abolished illegal armed formations. Evidently, the USSR Interior Ministry ought to check the situation on the spot and put everything in order. The leaders of

the republic and the opposition are not finding a common language on the questions of the distribution of resources and the investigation of a number of crimes. Here too, union bodies can and, in our view, must help to clarify things. Neither can the center fail to react, in our opinion, to cases such as the republic's parliament's deprivation of a number of opposition deputies of their powers, which does not come within the scope of union legislation and ought to be appropriately evaluated by the relevant bodies responsible for law enforcement and protection of the USSR Constitution.

Incidentally, I should also like to draw your attention, comrades, to the fact that in the one covnersation Moshanu, chairman of the Supreme Soviet of Moldova, stated that the refusal to participate in the USSR referendum was also connected with the union leadership's disrespectful, unjust attitude to Moldova and the Moldovans. We are not inclined to overrate such statements, but even if it is partially just, we ought to think seriously about it. We believe that systematic, direct contacts between the leaders of the union and the republic could help to remove these complaints, or at least most of them, and unnecessary tension there.

Further, the questions of involvement in work on the union treaty were discussed fairly thoroughly with the leadership of the republic and the opposition, with comrades and in collectives. We indicated that this non-involvement does not achieve anything, does not encourage consolidation, and only provokes what must be called the opposition's well-founded criticism on this matter. In reply, we received a promise to think about this issue. I believe the statement by the leadership of the country and nine union republics, which appeared in the press yesterday will be a good subject for reflection by the leadership of the Republic of Moldova. I also think that it is possible to do some work with the leadership of that republic in this area, and it is not ruled out that it will return, all the same, to subsequent work on the draft. We would consider it necessary to continue the mediatory functions of USSR people's deputies, and on a more permanent basis.

I shold also like to note, comrades, that the latest steps taken by the republic's leadership, unfortunately, do not demonstrate a desire for serious dialogue and consolidation with the opposite side. Here is one obvious example. First, in my view, it is indicated by the absence of the leaders from our sitting today. Second, another approach and another example. During our contacts with the leadership and the opposition, we reached agreement that there is a need—and this was agreed—for a round-table meeting, for calm, businesslike, constructive dialogue on the problems that have accumulated. The result of this was that a sitting of the presidium of the Supreme Soviet of Moldova was set, to which the leaders of the towns and districts of the Dnestr region and the south of the republic were invited as defendants accused of violations of the legislation and constitution of Moldova. Probably, we are not inclined to support those who violate the law and constitution, whoever does it, but, probably, if it is a matter of dialogue and seeking accord and consolidation, it would not be expedient or sensible to act in that fashion. [end recoding] [passage omitted]

[Lazarevich] I should like you to hear extracts from some of the speeches. Here, in part, is what people's deputy Akhromeyev, who has already been elected twice from the Moldovan town of Beltsy, said. He often visits that region and knows well what is going on there:

[Begin Akhromeyev recording] The peculiarities of Moldova, I am deeply convinced, are that, undoubtedly, the majority of the people, both the Moldovans and the other nationalities who live on the territory of Moldova, are in favor of the union, of a single union, and of the republic remaining in the union. In this sense, the leadership of Moldova is isolated. I have seen this, and it is shown by the referendum. So, in conditions where it was forbidden to hold the referendum, and force was used to prevent the referendum from being held, in Beltsy and nearby villages 65 percent of all the electors voted, and 98 percent of them voted for the union. In my opinion, it is impossible to think up any better proof. At the same time, force is being used in Moldova as nowhere else, and I know that this mood exists. I can tell you that I, personally, was present and experienced for myself the way that polling stations were closed and destroyed in Kishinev, and it was only with great protection from the militia that I was able to get through to those polling states. And as for what went on, what was said to me and how I was insulted, it is hard to tell you. And those are the methods which were used while the referendum was being held. I believe that we shall not achieve success without a fundamental evaluation of what is going on. [end recording] [passage omitted]

[Lazarevich] This discussion was summed up by Rafik Nishanovich Nishanov, chairman of the Chamber of Nationalities:

[Begin Nishanov recording] We are not taking any actions that could be viewed by the leadership of the Republic of Moldova as some kind of coercion. Neither the Soviet of Nationalities, nor the USSR Supreme Soviet, nor the president has that intention. We respect and recognize the sovereignty of each republic, but we do not want the leadership or parliament of the Republic of Moldova to use violent or illegal methods against the population of the republic resident in various parts. We want the rights of every person to be protected: his right to his native language and culture, to the preservation of his traditions, to guarantees of his safety. I do not support the extreme speeches of a number of deputies who are accusing only one side. I believe that there is blame on both sides here.

We are now gripped by one concern. Let us find ways of bringing the positions together and preserving the Republic of Moldova. But if the parliament of Moldova does not want to preserve that unity and to belong to the Soviet Union, nobody will impede the process of Moldova's secession from the Soviet Union. But one has to act

in accordance with the law. We have a law on secession from the USSR. For this, a referendum must be held in the Republic of Moldova. During the referendum the people will say who wants to stay and who wants to leave. It will be decided by the people, not the leaders of various political currents. If circumstances develop in a way that means a referendum is held, and the people of Moldova want to leave the union, let them leave. Then those who do not want to leave and are living in concentrations in some regions, it will be clear what status they can acquire. But now we cannot recognize any other status than a united Moldova which belongs to the Soviet Union, in accordance with the USSR constitution. [end recording]

Nishanov Remarks on Moldova

LD2604101291 Moscow Central Television Second Program Network in Russian 1940 GMT 25 Apr 91

[Speech by Rafik Nishanov, chairman of the USSR Council of Nationalities, on the Moldavian situation, from the "USSR Supreme Soviet Session" program on proceedings at the USSR Supreme Soviet session in Moscow on 25 April—recorded]

[Text] The Soviet of Nationalities is today discussing the question of ways to achieve accord, not ways to divide powers and form new states. The Soviet of Nationalities cannot have double standards. We live in a state that has a Constitution and laws, and republics have sovereign rights, in accordance with our Constitution, and we have to respect that. As for the fact that this critical situation has arisen, the blame for which lies with all sides, both the parliament of the People's Front of Moldova, and significant active involvement by certain forces in the Gagauz and Dnestr regions, I would say that these are the factors that actually led to this confrontation. We have to seek ways.

Further on Nishanov Remarks

LD2604150991 Moscow Central Television Second Program Network in Russian 2003 GMT 25 Apr 91

[Speech by Rafik Nishanov, chairman of the USSR Council of Nationalities, on the Moldovian situation, from the "USSR Supreme Soviet Session" program on proceedings at the USSR Supreme Soviet session in Moscow on 25 April—recorded]

[Text] A principled assessment of the actions of the leadership of Moldova, and of the actions of the leaders of the movements of the Gagauz and the Dnestr region which Comrade Akhromeyev has spoken about here was given in the USSR president's decree of 22 December, last year. The Soviet of Nationalities supports these assessments and the proposed measures.

Unfortunately, the leadership of Moldova did not accept our invitation and did not come to the particular session but this does not mean that Moldova is not taking part in the discussion of this question. As you, yourselves have seen, speeches have been made by deputies from the Republic of Moldova representing all groups of the population and all regions of Moldova. And we are in a position to work out recommendations and I think that the draft which has been presented gives such an opportunity.

We are not applying any actions which could be regarded by the leadership of the Republic of Moldova as some sort of coercion. The Soviet of Nationalities, the USSR Supreme Soviet, and the president do not have any such intention. We respect and we acknowledge the sovereignty of every republic and acknowledge the right to self-determination. We would like the voice of the Soviet of Nationalities to be listened to in any and all parts of the Republic of Moldova and we would like Moldova, in accordance with yesterday's invitation which was made by the leaders of the nine republics and the president of the USSR, to participate in our single political, economic, social, and cultural expanse.

I think that the work which you and I are doing together with the plenipotentiary representatives and the Supreme Soviets of the republics for the sake of the renewal of our union gives full opportunity to be within the union and at the same time to ensure full and realistic political, economic, and other sorts of independence. It is necessary simply to travel along this path.

Akhromeyev on Moldova

LD2604112291 Moscow Central Television Second Program Network in Russia 1945 GMT 25 Apr 91

[Speech by Marshal of the Soviet Union Sergey Akhroneyev from the "USSR Supreme Soviet Session" program on proceedings at the USSR Supreme Soviet Session in Moscow on 25 April—recorded]

[Text] Since I have already been in Moldova for eight years I have visited most regions of the republic more than once and I know the republic, and not only the Tiraspol region, the Gagauz, and the whole constituency, but other constituencies, too. And from this point of view, I think I have the right to express my opinion because I can given an objective assessment of the situation, as I understand it, of course. I am in favor—well, I may not be a member of the Soviet of Nationalities, I am a member of the Soviet of the Union, I am simply expressing my opinion to you, comrade—I am in favor, of course, of adopting this draft decision, because it will contribute to some extent to an easing of the acute nature of the situation, and our attempts will not be in vain. But, on the other hand, I believe that there should be a fundamental appraisal as to best—from yours and my point of view, from that of the Supreme Soviet, or from that of the president of the country—a fundamental appraisal as to what is happening in Moldova. And only on this basis, when the Soviet people know the truth, to warn the leadership, and the leadership of these republics as to what they are leading the Moldovan people to, and what they are leading the republic to?

[sentence as heard] And on this basis to then carry out work on reducing the acute nature of the differences, and so that the leadership and the republican Supreme Soviet come to their senses and not turn the way they want to know—i.e. take the republic out of the Union and divert the people away from our Soviet people—but instead lead us to a rapprochement. And the fact that they are now refusing to sign a Union treaty, and the fact that the are virtually rejecting a federation, virtually rejecting a confederation, these are just pure words. If course, this is absolutely impermissible, and our people should know the truth.

Kiselev on Moldova

LD2804153791 Moscow Central Television Second Program Network in Russian 1931 GMT 25 Apr 91

[Speech by Gennadiy Kiselev, head of the USSR Supreme Soviet commission investigating the situation in Moldova, in the Kremlin on 25 April; from the "At the USSR Supreme Soviet Session" program—recorded]

[Text] We were searching for possible ways for progress to consolidation and constructive dialogue between the opposing sides [in Moldova] and striving not to exacerbate the situation but, on the contrary, to facilitate rapprochement. However, the conclusion to which our group came as a result of consultations, meetings, and conversations is depressing. The main provisions of the USSR president's decree of 22 December on the situation in the republic of Moldova have not been fulfilled. Nonetheless, the decree as a whole was received with understanding in the republic. Some things have been done to realize it. The decree was examined at a session of the Supreme Soviet of the republic. The new organs of power formed in the Dnestr region, and the south of the republic temporarily suspended their activity. In a word, the decree facilitated a certain decrease in tension in interethnic relations.

It has played a positive role in the stabilization of the situation, especially during the first stages of its execution, as it were, during the time immediately after its issue. In addition, one cannot, to be fair, fail to note that the republican leadership intends returning to individual provisions of the decree at the May session of the Moldovan Supreme Soviet. Under discussion, inter alia, will be the application of the law on the functioning of languages on the territory of Moldova, and a number of other questions. Nonetheless, comrades, I have to note that the main issues remain unresolved; particularly recently, constructive steps to implement the presidential decree and consolidate the various political forces in the republic have not been taken.

Further, the questions of involvement in work on the Union Treaty were discussed fairly thoroughly the the leadership of the republic and the opposition, with comrades, and in collectives. We indicated that this non-involvement does not achieve anything, does not encourage consolidation, and only provokes what must be called the well-founded criticism of the opposition on this matter. In reply, we received a promise to think about this issue. I believe the statement by the leadership of the country and nine union republics, which appeared in the press yesterday, will be a good subject for reflection by the leadership of the Republic of Moldova. I also think that it is possible to do some work with the leadership of that republic in this area, and it is not ruled out that it will return, all the same, to subsequent work on the draft.

I think that we all would welcome this option. Proceeding from the fact that on many fundamental political issues—and we gained this impression—the republic's leadership is demonstrating a certain hesitancy, and that far from all opportunities to hand to search for consensus and constructive solutions have been exhausted, we would consider it necessary to continue the mediatory functions of USSR people's deputies, and on a more permanent basis. It has turned out that we have been something like the fifth or sixth group already, and every time the local comrades have been forced to bring us up to date with affairs. We had to sort out all the specific details, and so forth. We propose doing this on a permanent basis.

I would also like to note, comrades, that the latest steps by the republic's leadership unfortunately do not demonstrate a desire for serious dialogue and consolidation with the opposite side. Here is one obvious example: First, in my view, it is indicated by the absence of the leaders from our sitting today. Second, another approach and another example: During our contacts with the leadership and the opposition, we reached agreement that there is a need—and this was agreed to—for a roundtable meeting for a calm, businesslike, and constructive dialogue on the problems which have accumulated, a search for compromises, consensus, and so forth.

What was the result of this, so to speak, although both sides have agreed that this is necessary? The result of this was that a sitting of the Supreme Soviet Presidium of Moldova was set, to which the leaders of the towns and districts of the Dnestr region and the south of the republic were invited as defendants accused of violations of the legislation and constitution of Moldova. Probably we are not inclined to support those who violate the law and constitution, whoever does it, however, if it is a matter of dialogue and seeking accord and consolidation, it would not be expedient or sensible to act in that fashion.

Another question also arises: why are different standards applied to oneself and to others? According to the republican leadership, the Union laws and the USSR Constitution may be violated, but the Moldovan laws must not be. I think that here some violators don't look any better than others. Therefore, we think that here also there is little which is constructive in this approach.

One more point which I would like to emphasize. I don't know, of course, you and I have already become accustomed to the fact that one must treat the press with caution; however, in April information has been appearing in the press that President Snegur supposedly gave an interview to the MUNDO Spanish newspaper, and information on this was in the SOYUZ newspaper No. 15 for the month of April, which literally says the following—I am simply asking you to evaluate this statement from the point of view of a desire for dialogue and a search for constructive decisions:

The Dnestr and Gagauz republics represent pseudo-republics, which are backed and financed by Moscow to create an obstacle to our independence, and to validate military intervention. Well, what do you think? Are such approaches, so to speak, capable of consolidating and leading to sensible and fruitful solutions?

Nonetheless, we are convinced that we must search for consensus. If the conflict is drawn out it will increase its explosive potential. After all, comrades, tens of thousands of people believe in confrontation, and in our view the republican leadership underestimates this factor. It considers that such behavior in the Dnestr region and the south of the republic is a matter of some small group of separatists, but we have had the opportunity to satisfy ourselves that basically these ideas permeate far from a small group of the population, but a very broad strata of the population, and to joke about this is to play with fire.

The longer this confrontation is maintained, the more probable becomes a tragic outcome. One must not underestimate this. We have probably all experienced enough bitter lesons. This is why today we appeal to all the opposing sides—let's show respect for the law, for one another, abandon those offensive ambitions, and attempt to agree in an honest dialogue. It is necessary to do all this for the sake of the good of the people, and not for the sake of someone's ambitions or victories or defeats.

We also appeal to the Union bodies not to withhold their time nor to waste it, that is, to do everything dependent on them to avert a new tragedy in the country, and to help our fellow citizens to get out of crisis with dignity while it is not too late. Probably this document does not yield a global solution, nonetheless, it will be a step in the right direction. When it is a question of people's fates, then in our view any positive steps must be valued, because—and we must go in this direction—because only those treading the path will get to the end of it.

USSR Supreme Soviet Proceedings 26 Apr

LD2604220991

[Editorial Report] Moscow Central Television Second Program Network in Russian at 1848 GMT on 26 April carries a 66-minute program of recorded excerpts of the USSR Supreme Soviet session at the Kremlin in Moscow on 26 April.

The program begins with the Supreme Soviet standing for one minute to honor the memory of those who died in the Chernobyl accident.

Anatoliy Lukyanov chairs the meeting and outlines the agenda. He says the Supreme Soviet adopted amendments to the law on labor on 11 March. It was handed over to the USSR president. The president has returned the document without having signed it. Now it is submitted for repeat debates and a repeat vote.

The president returned the law to the Supreme Soviet because of Article 18, which considers whether trade unions can object to an administration decision to fire an employer. It says a person can be fired despite the fact that the trade union may disagree. The president believes this amendment contravenes the existing law on trade unions, which confirms that a person can be fired only with the trade union's consent. Moreover, the participation of trade unions in a decision on dismissal is very important, the president believes. Considering that there is a threat of unemployment, the president is concerned with the wording of Article 18, Lukyanov says.

This is the issue which the Supreme Soviet has to debate. The Supreme Soviet can confirm the wording of Article 18 despite the president's decision only if two-thirds vote in favor. It seems to me, Lukyanov says, the view of the committee should be heard. Either the law on trade unions or Article 18 of the law on labor should be changed, Lukyanov says.

At 1858 GMT Gritsenko from the Committee for Labor takes the floor. He proposed that the date for enforcing Article 18 should be postponed from 1992 until later. He is followed by Deputy Kalmykov and Okunkov who express the view that the administration and the employee in question should go to court if they disagree on the question of dismissal.

At 1915 GMT Deputy Korenev says he is in favor of trade unions taking part in decision-making on firings.

At 1923 GMT Deputy Grib says enforcement of Article 18 should be suspended. Deputy Yarin says the administration should be able to go court if the employee to be fired disagrees. Gritsenko proposes revised wording for Article 18.

At 1929 GMT Lukyanov sums up that the revised version is to be debated at a later date.

At 1930 GMT President Gorbachev begins to speak. He covered many subjects, from Japan and the Far East to the Union treaty. He speaks for 24 minutes.

At 1954 GMT Lukyanov reads out the Supreme Soviet decision on Gorbachev's visit to Japan, and the program ends.

Gorbachev Addresses Supreme Soviet 26 Apr

CM2704154591 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
27 April 91 Second Edition p 2

[Speech by President Mikhail Gorbachev at the Supreme Soviet in the Moscow Kremlin on 26 April: "M.S. Gorbachev Speech to USSR Supreme Soviet Session"]

[Text] Esteemed members of the Supreme Soviet. My speech to you today is devoted, as has been announced, to the visits to Japan and the Republic of Korea.

A visit to Japan has long been on the agenda, and it is understandable. The abnormality of such a frozen state of relations with Japan was perceived ever stronger against the background of cardinal changes in the world, in Soviet-American relations, in Europe, and, especially, after the end of the Cold War. It is abnormal when two great neighboring peoples and two great world powers fail to overcome, after almost half a century, the consequences of war and, in a new world situation, to get rid of the burden of the cold war. There is still no peace treaty that would draw a juridical line under the events that have, actually, left behind a deep sense of bitterness, alienation, and distrust between our two countries and peoples. In short, the relations between two such neighbors, obviously, neither met their requirements, nor fulfilled their potential.

Second, the state of these relations affects the whole international process, due to the real weight of these two states in world politics, particularly, of course, in the Asian-Pacific region, which accounts for almost half of the globe.

Without Soviet-Japanese interaction, construction of a new world order is not possible. This is what forms the main goal of our participation in international politics.

While preparing for the visit, we proceeded from the assumption that the process of change in bilateral relations should not be forced and no pressure should be made. Nor should we wait for things to sort themselves out automatically and evade existing problems, no matter what they are. Since the problems are there, we must discuss and examine them, look for ways to overcome them, and, as philosophers say, remove the contradictions that have come to a head.

Over the decades we and Japan have shown each other that on the whole, we can live without each other. But the political, intellectual, and economic damage from doing so continued to mount up. And no one was better off for this.

These were the considerations which were at the basis of the positions prepared by us for the talks in Tokyo.

I must note that both abroad and at home a large amount of speculation, sweeping hypotheses, and mere conjectures, even of a slanderous variety, arose before the visit to Tokyo. So I also want to say straightaway from this rostrum that we went to Japan in order to take our relations to a new level. That was the aim, that was the intention behind the trip—to try to place business ties on a dependable, dynamic, mutually advantageous basis, and not at all to try to "obtain" something in exchange for political concessions. By and large the results of the visit lived up to our expectations, although time will tell what their worth is.

But first of all, a few words about the general atmosphere in which it took place. If I were to characterize it in one word, I would call it a friendly atmosphere. We were told that Japan retains a watchful, even ill-disposed attitude toward the Soviet Union. Probably echoes of the dark pages in our common history have been preserved by the Japanese. But we did not see this directly. On the contrary. During all the meetings with a very representative part of Japanese society—parliamentarians, the youth, business circles, numerous individuals of various ranks and political orientations, we invariably felt genuine interest, liking, frankness, goodwill, and respect for our country. Speaking frankly, on the whole we were not counting on such a reception from the public or on such feelings being displayed. This was a surprise for us.

We had a tumultuous and ardent reception. Huge masses of the population of this famous city of almost half a million came out onto the streets. I had not expected such an outburst of kind feelings for the Soviet people and the Soviet Union. I regard as one of the most important aspects of my visit a clearly expressed desire on the part of the Japanese people to improve our relations. In this respect one can speak of one people getting through to another. In any case the "enemy image", the heritage of the war between us and of the cold war, have receded considerably.

Our visit to the cemetery of Japanese soldiers in Khabarovsk found a broad response in Japan, as well as our handing over of lists of POWs who died in the USSR, our condolences to their families, and our gratitude for their careful attention to the graves of Russian seamen on Japanese soil. All this was rightly viewed as our desire to draw a line under the past, as an expression of humanist principles in the new Soviet policy, and as a change in the sentiments of Soviet people.

It is understandable that at the center of the program of the visit was the meeting we were to hold with the top leadership of Japan. My talks with Prime Minister Kaifu were described by both of us as open and constructive.

But everyone noticed that they were very complex. At times they took a dramatic turn. Instead of the planned three rounds of talks, we held six, even eight conversations if you include the breaks too. In fact, in my whole experience of holding talks—and my experience is fairly extensive—that is the first unique case of its kind worth recording in the Guinness Book of Records. Overall that was a substantive "negotiating marathon." It took many solid hours of working time.

The difficulties which we naturally foresaw were connected with the legacy of the war. This is the problem of

territorial demarcation, or as the Japanese call it, the "Northern Territories". For a long time we pretended this problem did not exist; however, it would not go away. This became clearer and clearer as we began to look into it objectively, studying the history fo the question and its juridical, political, and psychological aspects. In our contacts with the Japanese representatives over the years, we could not help feeling how much this problem had taken root in the national consciousness, and it could not now be resolved unilaterally.

In preparing for the trip we carefully weighed everything, delved into the experts' arguments, took account of public opinion and the press, and studied various recommendations, including those from parliamentarians of the Union and Russia. There was no shortage of opinion and a great deal of discord. Our approach consisted of this: mutual understanding had to be sought through progress toward a peace treaty which would become the document of a final postwar settlement, including territorial demarcation, to start this process by creating a new environment, and to reach the point of a new level of relations and a new quality.

The talks, I repeat, were difficult. Sometimes the arguing went on for hours. I will quote examples to illustrate. On one occasion our Japanese partners proposed replacing a verb with a noun. More than one round was spent on this. Then we spent 90 minutes arguing over a single word before reaching agreement. This is very serious, this is the result of our discussions, but behind that result are decades of our relations.

There were moments when we would experience an impasse. Each would insistently—naturally bringing his own arguments into play—stand up for his position and the state interests of his country. The Japanese premier, in justifying his approach, would refer to the people's opinion, and we with no less justification would refer to the opinion of the Soviet people, to the vital interests and position of the inhabitants of the Far East, who are directly affected by the problem.

Incidentally it is not only the Japanese but also all of our foreign interlocutors and partners who must set out from the premise that in the USSR there now exists an effective, independent public opinion and parliamentary institutions, and the Soviet leadership relies on them.

In the end, nevertheless, we arrived at a joint political statement, which registers agreement on a broad range of issues. In this respect neither we nor the Japanese side lost anything. As certain newspapers wrote, there was a "fighting draw." We managed to agree on a key formula that takes Soviet-Japanese relations away from the "preconditions" and "categorical demands" and opens up the prospect of their friendly development.

The joint statement speaks of the paramount importance of speeding up work on completing the preparation of a peace treaty and of the fact that with this in view, it is necessary to act constructively and dynamically, making use of the positive things that have been amassed in bilateral talks in various years beginning in 1956, when Japan and the USSR jointly declared an end to the state of war and the restoration of diplomatic relations between them.

There is both realism in policy and a recognition of past and present realities. It reflects the positions of both sides and a general striving to speed up work on a peace treaty. There is mention of the year 1956, when a joint declaration was adopted, which was at the time ratified by the USSR Supreme Soviet and by the Japanese Parliament.

Prime Minister Kaifu insisted that the 1956 declaration be referred to in the statement. We did not agree to this. The reason was that it speaks not only of the end of a state of war and the restoration of diplomatic relations but also of the handover to Japan of two islands after the conclusion of a peace treaty. We consider that one ought to rely only on that part of the document which became a historical reality and had international legal and physical consequences. What did not take place and what subsequent history had, as it were, "erased", cannot 30 years later simply be revived in this way. The chance has been missed. Since then new realities have arisen, and it is necessary indeed to proceed on the basis of them.

As a result we have precisely this and no other formula in the statement, and it means that there has been enormous progress. After all, even quite recently our discussion on this subject with Japanese officials would proceed in a simple way and would take not hours but indeed just a few minutes. They would raise and confront us with the territorial issue, and we would say that no territorial issue existed.

The document now adopted demonstrates that, on the one hand, both sides have gone along a certain path, and on the other, that both sides will act, proceeding from experience amassed, and will search for the solution to problems along the course of realistic policy, taking into account the balance of interests.

It might be asked—and actually this is commonly said, I know—what is the point of obscuring the issue? Tell us directly: Will we give up the islands or not? We will hold talks, we will ease and encourage contacts between Soviet and Japanese people, including on those islands. We submitted proposals on this point, and, as you have noticed, they were also recorded in the joint statement. I am confident that mutually acceptable solutions can be found, but this requires a different atmosphere and a different character of relations, those relations need to be made irreversible, and they must be interdependent and interconnected to a greater degree.

The statement recognizes as expedient the development [razvertyvaniye] of constructive cooperation (development rather than the restating of what already exists!) in trade and economic, scientific, technical, political, and other spheres.

The aspiration for the deepening and development of links in various spheres, including trade, industry, fishing, science, technology, transport, ecology, culture, and humanitarian questions—all this found specific expression in a package of agreements and documents of unprecedented volume. In all, 15 of them have been signed.

We drew attention to the fact that realization of the worldwide consequences of the success or failure of the transformations in the Soviet Union is evolving in Japan. And this disposes Japanese business circles toward cooperation with us. The Japanese premier persistently reminded us of the principle of the linkage of economics and politics. The Japanese interpretation of this means that there cannot be dynamism and scale in economic cooperation without a resolution of the territorial question.

I answered that I accept the principle, but I understand the linkage in the following way: politics and economics must work for each other's benefit, thereby enriching the relations as a whole. One influences the other and vice versa, and it is not for politics to hamper the development of economic ties.

I would like to dwell on some of the directions of cooperation that were discussed during the visit, or in connection with it. One of the important issues is fishing and opening up the riches of the sea. It is an issue of enormous significance for both ourselves and the Japanese. On our part, the desirability of participation by Japanese companies in modernization of fish-processing enterprises was emphasized. In exchange, we could examine the issue of fishing quotas. We agreed to continue the talks and at the governmental level, to make efforts to preserve, reproduce, and use the oceanic resources in the optimum way.

Now to the scientific and technological fields. The Japanese are interested in our scientific potential, and they see in it a significant resource for intensification of economic cooperation, particularly in connection with conversion. The Supreme Soviet commission for science and technology and the State Committee for Science and Technology, as well as other departments, will have sufficient reasons to examine the line of action and to determine what can be given over for joint development, without damage to defense, with considerable benefit to our national economy and to its needs today, but also keeping in mind the long-term purposes of our economic policies.

Considerable attention was given to cooperation in the use of the resources of Siberia and the Far East. We invite Japanese companies to take part in overall development programs for gas and oil deposits of Western Siberia and in modernization of a number of oil refineries.

As to mineral resources as an object of cooperation, a significant part here belongs to the Russian Federation, the USSR Cabinet of Ministers, the Council of Ministers of Russia, to ministries and local bodies. It looks as if the time has come to transform good intentions into a specific program. The Union and the Russian governments will have much to do to develop oil and gas deposits in Sakhalin and its shelf, and this was discussed. I must say, by the way, that work on this issue began as far back as 1975 and still no results are to be seen there.

Of special significance to us is the agreement which has been signed on technical assistance to economic reform in the Soviet Union. The Japanese are eager for such cooperation. They have something to teach us: the methods of state influence on the development of the economy, which are well ordered in Japan; the methodology of predicting scientific and technical progress; their experience of the financial, banking and budget system; state support of small businesses, and other things. Of course we must not be euphoric and suppose that economic cooperation will take off tomorrow. These matters are not simple. But I must share my observations with you. The interest on the part of business circles in the meetings and conversations with us was great. An unprecedented number of businesses gathered, and this happened in Tokyo, and then in the old capital of Kyoto. But the important thing is that we put the options and ideas on the table, on the table of further discussions. And the animation will begin. But it will begin, of course, if we show ourselves to be reliable partners. The Japanese businessmen justly complain that we are poorly organized. And that complaint, by the way, does not come only from that quarter.

In the very near future a special presidential instruction will be issued on implementation of the accords reached during the visit. We can consider that one of the positive results of the visit has been that for the first time at summit level, an exchange—a useful exchange of views has taken place on major problems of **world politics**, with the accent, of course, on Asia and the Pacific. The contribution of the Soviet Union to the positive changes here is that since the Vladivostok and Krasnoyarsk initiatives, we have considerably improved or established for the first time relations with many countries in that part of the world. We have, for our part, taken important steps in favor of military detente. We have proved our willingness to engage in equal and constructive participation and in establishing multilateral cooperation, both economically and on the plane of achieving mutual security.

In some capitals attention has been drawn to the idea we put forward in Tokyo for a five-sided meeting to be attended by the Soviet Union, the United States, China, India, and Japan. There has also been some conjecture about this. Therefore, I would like to explain that the point of the idea is solely to give impetus to discussions on the topical problems of this region. In our view, it would be most expedient to begin the process by elucidating the views of the great powers in this region. We have absolutely no secret plans to settle anything behind the backs of anyone else or to reach agreement on any mechanisms, structures, and so on. We are principled

supporters of internationalizing the joint search for ways to achieve trust and cooperation.

We have the same attitude on the activity of the well-known seven economically most potent states. This was also under discussion at the talks with Prime Minister Kaifu. We approach relations with the Japanese in the broadest context of a course toward the strengthening of global security and worldwide cooperation. And it seems that this line of ours is meeting with understanding, including in the United States.

The positive results of the visit are in evidence. What took place in Japan during those days permits us to believe that a breakthrough in Soviet-Japanese relations is possible. There has been no breakthrough as yet. It is yet to be achieved. But perhaps the most difficult step has been made. The main contours of a breakthrough have been marked.

Our ideas of how we must act in the future have come closer together. This is the main achievement. The important thing now is for us and the Japanese not to miss the opportunity provided by history, as has already happened once before.

We have invited Prime Minister Kaifu to visit the Soviet Union already this year. The summit dialogue initiated in Tokyo will thus be continued.

The USSR Supreme Soviet can also do much to make Soviet- Japanese relations more dynamic. What has been agreed should be taken under observation by the Supreme Soviet and its committees. Incidentally, the Japanese Parliament has contributed a great deal to the preparation and creation of the distinctive atmosphere of this visit. And in the course of the visit very important conversations took place with the leaders of parliamentary factions.

We are expecting a weighty, constructive contribution by the Russian Federation, which directly borders Japan and has the greatest experience and interest in cooperation with her. Representatives of Russia took part in the talks and in all the functions in the course of the visit.

You obviously know that Prime Minister Kaifu, and other Japanese politicians have positively assessed the results of the talks, and consider the visit to be a significant event.

Mainly positive appraisals have been heard in other countries. The improvement in Soviet-Japanese relations cannot do any harm to anyone, and it is not only our two states that will benefit from this. In the long term, the results of the first visit of a Soviet head of state to Japan cannot help affecting the overall world situation too.

Concerning the visit to the **Republic of Korea**: Despite its brevity, it possesses independent significance. This was the third Soviet-South Korean summit meeting in ten months. The rapid progress here has been achieved not through any artificial forcing of relations with a new partner. Changes had long been due but they were held back by the system of confrontation and by the division of countries into "ours" and "theirs". We have started breaking down the barriers left behind by the Cold War and opened up the road to civilized dialogue with all who are ready to be guided by the criteria of the new world politics. I am convinced that the good relations with the Republic of Korea, and hence with a large proportion of the Korean nation, will help the realization of the aspirations of the whole Korean people: the unification of the country. We are doing everything incumbent on us to improve the foreign policy atmosphere around this process in which the sovereign role of the two Korean states themselves is indisputable. We welcome the dialogue which has begun between them. Our initiative to conclude a treaty of good-neighborliness and cooperation between the Soviet Union and the Republic of Korea is in keeping with the tasks of improving the atmosphere in the Korean Peninsula.

We regard our society's interests as paramount in Soviet foreign policy. Therefore, we particularly appreciate those partners who have demonstrated effective solidarity with our country, at a time when we are most in need of support. I considered it necessary publicly to express high appreciation of the bold and far-sighted policy and position of President No Tae-u. He and the Government of the Republic of Korea are not inclined to wait and see what the changes in our country lead to. The president has vigorously set about the organization of relations with the Soviet Union. On Cheju Island there was a detailed and frank conversation on current and long-term questions of our commercial and economic cooperation. The problems which had arisen regarding the implementation of the agreement on a $3 billion credit to the Soviet Union were completely eliminated by the president of the Republic of Korea and the use of this credit was specified. In particular, agreement was reached on speeding up deliveries of consumer goods and starting them in May. We came to an agreement to increase goods exchange in the current year to 1.5 billion dollars and by the year 1995 to 10 billion dollars.

The current pace and increase in the turnover of goods indicate that this is possible. During the last four years it has doubled annually. We have reached agreement on stepping up cooperation in the investment sphere, especially in the processing of oil. In South Korea technology permits a 90-95 percent degree of refining to be reached and the economic effect is increased by 20 or more percent. If we succeed in implementing joint projects then with a maintainence of oil extraction even at the level of 1990 the urgent needs of the country may be met. Forty eight major projects in the industrial and technological spheres are under discussion, including some concerning the assimilation of the natural resources of the Far East and Siberia. At present very strict controls or restrictions on technologies are in place and South Korea is experiencing difficulties because of this—it would very much welcome and very much wants to cooperate with us in this sphere.

South Koreans know what we have at our disposal and are proposing cooperation.

I hope that an agreement on cooperation in the fisheries sphere will soon be signed. We will be concluding talks on opening direct maritime communications with South Korea.

It should at the same time be noted that the implementation of all of this not only depends on the interest and goodwill of our Korean partners but also on the extent to which we ourselves are prepared for cooperation according to rules which are generally accepted throughout the world, and whether we are able to introduce order to our own home and to overcome destructive tendencies which would lead to the ruin of the single economic space. It would be worthwhile for us to take a closer and more attentive look at the experience South Korea, which during the shortest of time periods has overcome economic backwardness and emerged into the front ranks. Incidentally, the latter was in the near past also a totalitarian state. The Soviet Union and South Korea really may create an original, effective, model of economic interaction, integrating their potentials in those spheres where being mutually complementary is especially advantageous and promising.

In passing I would like to note the readiness of the leadership of South Korea to facilitate the Soviet Union's joining in the process of economic integration in the Asia-Pacific region. The president invited us to particpate in the international forum for Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation and also in the World Exhibition Expo-93 which will be held in Seoul. And so the plan for trust and good-neighborliness with the Republic of Korea has now been raised to quite a high level. We have established good and durable relations with a country that has not just taken up a respected and promising position in the world economy, but which is playing an increasingly noticeably active and constructive role in world politics. Consequently our interaction will also become an international factor. The visits to Japan and the Republic of Korea, and their results, show that in spite of all the difficulties and the upheavals which our country is experiencing, we remain true to the policy of new thinking. As president I consider it my state duty to do my utmost to ensure the most favorable external conditions possible for the profound democratic transformations and the country's economic revival which have now entered the decisive phase.

Gorbachev Answers Questions

LD2704195891 Moscow Central Television Second Program Network in Russian 1930 GMT 26 Apr 91

[Question and Answer session with President M.S. Gorbachev from the "USSR Supreme Soviet Session" program on proceedings at the USSR Supreme Soviet session in Moscow on 26 April—recorded]

[Text] [Gorbachev] I have not said everything in the brief information I have given here. There was a specific idea which was expressed and discussed, and it could be the first step toward implementing fairly wide-ranging all-round cooperation in this region. This would be the organization of cooperation between countries bordering on the Sea of Japan. There is even a fairly interesting draft and studies, and this cooperation could quickly gain momentum here. Moreover, this program—a long-term one—will be based on the existing state of affairs. Therefore, it is very interesting. But I share your main idea. I attempted to speak about it in Khabarovsk when I met with comrades there and some of our projects, unfortunately important ones, which had been started, have for the meantime been pushed to one side as a result of the fact that we must overcome the crisis situation. But we must definitely return to opening up Siberia and the Far East.

In my view, we have reached just such an historical phase when this prediction of Lomonosov will be fulfilled regarding increasing the wealth of Russia, by opening this up.

And I share with you the approach that interests could be successfully combined and harmonized in this, moreover, on the basis of modern approaches and not on the basis of so-called predatory approaches to these regions. I think that this is the sort of region which was undoubtedly destined by God himself for active international cooperation.

Therefore, I would summarize these arguments of mine not only by saying that I agree with your thoughts, but also I think that, generally speaking, it is within my authority as president, in accordance with the results of the visit, to give instructions for a return both to working on this and updating it.

Incidentally, Vitaliy Ivanovich [Vorotnikov] will probably recall that this program went forward, but then it was subjected to criticism and many said that it should be thought out again differently in the new conditions. But a large amount of work has already been done here, not simply some amateur efforts, because the basis of this was what the Siberian branch of the Academy of Sciences and scientific centers of this region had worked out. Therefore they were substantial things, and science could also now put forward many interesting arguments. But this element of international cooperation was not worked out in detail. This is the first thing.

And second, on the program, the declaration? Comrade...?

[Kirillov] Kirillov.

[Gorbachev] Kirillov. Comrade Kirillov, I think I have spoken in such detail about this, including at the news conference, and in all my statements to the Japanese audience I have gone over this subject so much, that I think it would be disrespectful to assume that Comrade Kirillov has not read it. Perhaps he did not have time, the chimes rang and he got distracted and never got down to it. I will tell you what I am talking about.

I referred my Japanese audience and politicians to a specific experience: our relations with postwar Germany, its two parts. A very grave legacy. What a clash, what a catastrophe fascism led to both for us and the German nation. But the road has begun. The unification of Germany has just taken place. But a road has been travelled. Would that unification have taken place if it were not for the Moscow Treaty, and not just the Moscow Treaty but also the one with Czechoslovakia, with Poland, and the recognition of the frontiers along the Oder? That had to be travelled. And then the two German states joined the United Nations and then the Helsinki process took place, the postwar settlement. So, it is a completely different environment. One degree and level of cooperation led to another one. One degree of trust was replaced by another. Relations in Europe became quite different.

And then, together with the global impetus, so to speak, which both the nuclear and ecological threats gave us, this all served as a basis for the fact that we needed a new international policy, we needed a rejection of the Cold War methods and a transfer to a different phase of international relations. This is after all a very real experience.

And what existed five or 10 years ago seemed to us—and two or three years ago I, and all of you said, you know—that the situation of the German question is such, and it was occasioned specifically by history and let history see to it. Here history got going as a result of certain confluences of circumstances.

It was the same here. The same here. We must go for broad relations. Both working, and seriously, within the framework of the negotiation process on a peace treaty, not getting away from the problem of territorial demarcation but, naturally, creating an atmosphere in which it will really be easier to tackle any problems.

And there it will be clear how this issue should be resolved. I would prefer not to occupy myself with these fantasies now, but I would move in that direction. This is why, so to speak, the train has already left. And as for the declaration—there are two main points in it. It has allowed for the restoration of diplomatic relations. This has happened and that is that. And in this sense, there have been, so to speak, legal consequences from the document.

As regards the second part. There all the conditions were laid out, then all of this was changed. The treaty on security appeared long with many many others—I will not list them all. There was a completely different situation and what opened in 1956 had disappeared.

And, incidentally, Comrade Kirillov, if you are interested in specifics, then it was stated in that declaration that in responding to the Japanese appeal, the Soviet Union was showing good will about the handing over—something like good will. So the issue there, to say that it was acknowledged in the declaration that this was Japanese territory and it is to be returned—well, this is not how things stood, they did not stand like this.

Therefore, we have studied the finer details of this material thoroughly. Moreover, beginning with geographic discoveries, it was we who discovered them, and it was we who gathered the first tax from these islands. And reports to emperors and so on, and so on. I think that all of this is already just digging around in history, and attempts to explain something through some kinds of processes does not lead anywhere.

I think that what we proposed is a productive path to follow so as to develop relations and to create a different atmosphere of cooperation and trust and then we will resolve all issues including issues of territorial demarcation. Where we will fix the boundaries—we will resolve this, resolve it.

How was the joint statement prepared and what is intended to be done after it and in particular with regard to the union treaty? I considered it necessary to respond to the wishes which were expressed by my comrades, the leaders of the republics where a referendum had taken place, that a meeting was necessary, a conversation was necessary. For this reason, before I left for Japan I sent them telegrams with an invitation to meet. We all sat at a dacha outside the city; we sat, not at a roundtable but at a rectangular table, and we had a conversation. I should say that the corners do not have any significance. It is even useful: You can grasp a corner, as it were, but when everything is round, you round everything off and may not find a place to stop, whereas here everything was clear, you understand, who was being drawn to which corner and what corner he was holding on to! In general, a four-cornered table is a very good thing. We sat and spoke for around 10-12 hours, with breaks, we had lunch and everything. Yes. Yes.

Basically, it was a conversation. I think that it is necessary sometimes to sit down like that and talk directly, without, as they say, prepared points. The conversation, in the first half, part, was on the whole range of matters of concern, and where we are at and what we should be doing. And first it concerned the economy, constitutional order in the country, the things that worry all of us and, naturally, we also focussed on questions of the union treaty and what the application of new retail prices demonstrates, and so forth.

Basically, the conversation was direct, honest, open, and in a good atmosphere. A good atmosphee, I think that this was very important. I also say now that we must all, no matter which god we pray to, whatever national group we now belong to, whatever ideology we profess, whatever political movement we belong to, whatever deputies' action we... and so forth, all of this, let a man live, let him work, everything, discuss things, let him pray, let him argue, debate, perfect a platform, but now the situation calls for us to put aside everything. The problem now is the preservation of the state, the problem

is the preservation of the country, the life of the people, constitutional order. Everything, everything else must be put aside. If we don't realize this well enough, if someone attempts to play in this situation, I must... the people are already sorting out what is what.

And the main thing is that if we are not capable of carrying out things correctly, then we will simply be swept away, irrespective of what we profess and what aims we pursue. Thus, now, it is that case when common national interests, common human and common state ones, are higher than all group and political partialities let alone human feelings, sympathies and antipathies. They are absolute trivia.

The conversation was on this basis. And this is a specific example that if thoughts, judgements, evaluations and proposals rise to such a level, then it is possible to do business. I think that you welcome this agreement, because on the whole it is imbued with this. But it worked out, for everyone has now returned to the embrace of his environment, his surroundings, his advisers, consultants and so on. Now they will begin to tear them to pieces, it is already leaking out through the press, they are already imagining and checking who... to whom it is advantageous, who compromised with whom. This is all rubbish. It is advantageous to the fatherland, which needs to be dragged out of its difficulty and it must not be allowed to go beyond the final line. That's all. What advantage is there here? Listen. About what advantage... only petty political intrigue can give rise to such questions. We need to stand our ground and act on the basis of this agreement.

And via this I come to the union treaty, how are we to work? We discussed cardinal questions, key questions. A federation? Yes, a federation. Either a confederation or a federation. Yes. Further. The market, an all-union market, a single market, yes. And if there is a single market, then it is with the corresponding indices: money, finances, a prices policy, customs, what else is there? [Unidentified speaker says "Banks".] Banks. Yes. Everything. Taxes, taxes.

In regard to taxes, all this, there is an understanding that only with a single market, only by restoring and developing it and by cooperation—and not the other way around—will it be possible to solve the problems and emerge from the crisis. This is also very important for further work on the union treaty.

A dispute began over whether there should be a single or a triple system of taxation. There was such a discussion. However, I am a convinced supporter of the experience proven by the majority of states that a triple system is needed. Powers exist. Arising from these powers and commitment is a budget of varying size. Once there is a redistribution of responsibilities and powers it means that there is a redistribution of finances, too. Moreover, these can change from year to year. Therefore, each year there is a consideration of the percentage, whether it should be two, three, or zero. However, the most important thing is that there be a municipal tax, a republican tax, and a federal tax, and that is all.

As for the issue of the Russian Federation, the autonomous republics and the union, it is a big issue. The main thing without going into detail is that there should be a balance, and naturally, as we have all said repeatedly, the Russian factor and the role of Russia is an objective reality and it needs remembering. If it were demolished by anyone whatsoever and on the part of anyone whatsoever, the whole union would be demolished.

But you cannot approach matters from two standards, the Russian Federation and the federation as a union state. So a federation has certain criteria and principles. So, if they are for one federation therefore they are for the other. There are nuances here, so to speak. I think nuances will be taken into account, but the talks are useful, since everybody understands the responsibility. It is not we, not you and I, who have created this state, which is not ours only. Therefore, to think that we could decide its fate too easily. [sentence as heard] No, this is a case when we need to think and check everything a thousand times. In any case, this conversation was very interesting. We have agreed that we should move in this direction rapidly so that the process of ratification—or, rather, of signing—can follow. This will be followed by the constitution, and the constitution will be followed by the formation of the whole structure of bodies in our renewed state on the basis of everything which will take place.

Of course, this will naturally take time. But at least there are prospects here, and the stages can be discerned. And from this point of view, very important and necessary work has been done.

Are there any more questions?

[Lukyanov] Deputy Stadnik, please.

[Stadnik] Making use of the fact that the president is here now, it would probably be no bad idea to hear his opinion on the question I would like to raise. I would ask you to listen very attentively.

[Lukyanov] Attention, comrades.

[Stadnik] The point is about elements of the work of the Federation Council, and what I want to say, I want to find out, for example, about the adoption of those programs which we have adopted, commencing with the "500 days". All the programs have been confirmed, and they scarcely have begun when others have been adopted. I will not repeat them, you remember all of this and know what it is about. But no one has been made responsible for the failure to implement them. I will not enumerate all the examples relating to these programs, but I am not mistaken if I say that apart from the president and ourselves, one of the parties guilty of

marking time is the Federation Council, because concerted action depends to a very large extent upon the resolutions and agreements in this body.

What do we have at present? It goes through the Federation Council, then the republican leaders give interviews and make speeches at conferences, so to speak, and seemingly, one resolution appears in the media, and then we learn something totally different from the mouths of these figures. And you have to go and find out exactly what, in actual fact, took place. And on the whole, it turns out that we are the ones who are guilty of all crimes, because here we adopt laws which, as I have said, do not work.

As a result of this indecisiveness, in my view, on the whole, this so-called war of laws has ensued. But we and our respected government remain the ones who are guilty of all sins. To stop this, I propose that the Supreme Soviet adopts a short solution requesting that the Federation Council and, I would like to stress, the supreme soviets in the republics, not just in the Federation Council, establish a protocol by which every session of the Federation Council should subsequently relay its contents to the supreme soviets of the USSR and the republics.

The text of my resolution, the thrust of which I have recounted to you, is on the platform. I would ask you to pay some attention to this issue and support me.

[Gorbachev] Anatoliy Ivanovich [Lukyanov], could I give a small piece of information to resolve the crisis?

[Lukyanov] It is not a matter of crisis, Mikhail Sergeyevich, it is simply the great desire....

[Gorbachev, interrupting] I said that word with a smile. There is after all, a crisis, we will not trivialize this. On the Federation Council side, it is said in the same sort of polite form that the Supreme Soviet somehow has a jealous attitude toward the activities of the Federation Council. But this is, after all, a constitutional body, and not all of these proposals were prepared by the Supreme Soviet itself. Therefore, there can be no contradictions here between the Supreme Soviet and the Federation Council. We have one constitution and the same goals, and I think that the point which Comrade Stadnik is raising is, in my view, an issue of mutual information, nothing more. This must be decided and the question withdrawn. The Supreme Soviet has the right to know.

And, furthermore, so as to close this topic once and for all, the draft law on the Federation Council has been prepared, but we are not introducing it for one reason, that we are on the eve of a new union treaty, and this union treaty discusses the whole system and structure of Soviet bodies. And adopting at the present time a law where everything will, probably including the question which you have raised, be removed from the agenda if in a month or two we sign a new union treaty. Therefore it is necessary to wait for the union treaty which will soon come about, and the allocation of authority. The role—what the system of bodies will be like— will be determined. And then there will be a law and—I think, this question. But in the meantime I think it must be borne in mind, if there have arisen... once such a problem has arisen, it must be removed on the basis of a respectful attitude to one another.

Deputy Comments on Gorbachev Speech

LD2604151291 Moscow Radio Rossii Network in Russian 1330 GMT 26 Apr 91

[Interview with USSR People's Deputy Nikolay Vasilyevich Neyland by correspondent Andrey Zuyev at the USSR Supreme Soviet session at the Kremlin in Moscow on 26 April—live]

[Text] [Zuyev] Never before have I seen such a number of Japanese journalists within the building of the USSR Supreme Soviet. And this is hardly surprising. After all, exactly 50 minutes ago President Gorbachev reported to Union parliament members on the results of his visit to Japan and Korea. The president noted that the issues of mastering regions of Siberia and the Far East or their mineral resources involve Russia's interests. The president also noted that representatives of Russia had taken part in his trip, too. But in his speech, Mikhail Sergeyevich said that over decades we and Japan had proved that we could live without each other without detriment to social or economic issues. You, undoubtedly, will see this speech on television today.

I have asked Nikolay Vasilyevich Neyland, specialist, diplomat, and USSR people's deputy, to express his view on Gorbachev's speech.

[Neyland] Well, I think that this speech was very objective and correct in the sense that President Gorbachev, without exaggerating or belittling his achievements, talked about the way discussions were held and what had been attained. He used the expression: action draw [boyevaya nichya]. I would like to say that politics is the art of the possible and one must say that, going to Japan, President Gorbachev did not have very extensive opportunities. Unfortunately, a naive and primitive campaign alleging that he was going to sell something to Japan was launched in the country. Unfortunately, I have to mention that even such a cultured person as Artem Tarasov did him a bad turn. Well, one cannot change the past. The thing is that those four islands, speaking from the historical point of view—just look at their names! Those who maintain that they are part of Russian territory from time immemorial are mistaken, unfortunately. But this is not important today. The thing is that, although a breakthrough has not been achieved, possibilities for attaining a breakthrough have been opened in relations between Japan and the Soviet Union. And without becoming euphoric, in my view, the president and the whole delegation, including Russia's representatives, coped well with their task, using official language, so to speak.

[Zuyev] Nikolay Vasilyevich, the president said that for a long time we pretended that there was no territorial problem. But this is not so, and this problem cannot be solved unilaterally. There are many rumors about whether or not these islands will be given back. We could not make it out [word indistinct].

[Neyland] You see, one can say straightforwardly today that the Soviet Union is not prepared to give these islands back, and the situation itself, meaning the attitude and the situation within the country, is such that this is out of the question today. But I do not exclude that some time later this issue can be raised against a background of improving USSR-Japan relations and the situation in the world and so on, because one cannot ignore the Japanese side's opinion and history. It is clear that the Japanese have grounds, and one should not forget that in 1956 the Soviet parliament passed a decision on giving two islands back to Japan. So, one cannot alter facts.

[Zuyev] And the last question, Nikolay Vasilyevich. Some specialists say that if these islands were handed back, in two years each Soviet citizen would drive a Toyota.

[Neyland] Well, this is an exaggeration, of course. I am confident that one cannot simply give these two islands back today. This is only the beginning of negotiations. But I repeat my idea that, although this has not happened today, it can happen some time later and, first of all, in relation to the two islands covered by the USSR Supreme Soviet decision.

Resolution on Japan, ROK Visits

PM2804145991 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 27 Apr 91 Second Edition p 2

["USSR Supreme Soviet Resolution: On the Results of the USSR President's Visits to Japan and the Republic of Korea"]

[Text] After hearing USSR President M.S. Gorbachev's report on the official visit to Japan and the talks held with the ROK leadership, the USSR Supreme Soviet **resolves**:

1. To approve the results of the Soviet-Japanese and Soviet-South Korean summit talks.

2. To continue the work of deepening ties between the USSR Supreme Soviet and the Japanese parliament and to establish contacts with the ROK National Assembly.

3. That the USSR Supreme Soviet International Affairs Committee is to ensure constant monitoring of the course of the Soviet-Japanese talks on a peace treaty as well as on other aspects of the development of relations with Japan and the ROK, hearing periodical reports on these questions from the USSR Foreign Ministry and the USSR Ministry of Foreign Economic Relations.

A. Lukyanov, chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet

The Kremlin, Moscow. 26 April 1991

Gorbachev on Joint Statement With Leaders

LD2604170691 Moscow TASS in English 1640 GMT 26 Apr 91

[By TASS correspondent Vladimir Isachenkov]

[Text] Mocow April 26 TASS—President Mikhail Gorbachev said today that the joint statement signed by him on Tuesday along with the leaders of nine Soviet republics became possible because they put national interests "before all group or political affiliations, let alone human likes and dislikes".

He made the remarks in reply to questions from members of parliament.

Now that the republican leaders "returned to their environments, advisers and consultants", the most important thing is "to stick to this accord and act", Gorbachev said.

Noting that members of some of the signatories' teams are questioning the value of the agreement by asking who stands to gain most from it and who made most concessions, he dismissed these efforts as petty politicking.

The signed agreement is advantageous to the country "as a whole," Gorbachev stressed.

He said that the nine republican leaders during their meeting said yes to the federal structure of the projected new union and to an integral national market with common money, finances, pricing policy and taxes.

"We agreed... that we can overcome the crisis only by restoring and developing... a single market," Gorbachev said.

He said one issue raised at the meeting was the unity of not only the entire country but also of the Russian Republic. "By breaking up Russia—regardless of who does it and from which side, we break up the entire Union," Gorbachev said. He emphasised that there may be no double standards in this issue.

Gorbachev revealed that following the meeting "representatives of three other republics" phoned him in the Kremlin to ask why they had not been invited. "My answer was as follows: You did not conduct the referendum (on the future of the Soviet Union)," he said.

"The fact that after reading our joint statement, the leaders of the three republics immediately asked me to fill them in on the meeting and bear in mind that their attitude to it is positive indicates that the process will go ahead normally," Gorbachev said.

He did not identify the three republics in question.

Commenting on recent calls for the resignation of the country's higher authorities, Gorbachev said that

according to his information, the majority of the population, on the contrary, demand that constitutional order be restored and tough measures adopted where necessary.

He disclosed that early next month he will sign an executive order to introduce "a special, stringent regime of work" and "control" in basic industries and sectors producing consumer goods.

Gorbachev argued that "there has not yet been a single case of society going out of a crisis by abiding by market approaches alone".

"We shall scuttle all our programmes if we fail to take the situation in hand," he added. "We are living through the overcoming of the crisis and through unpopular tough measures. We cannot backpedal. If we don't do it, everything will collapse."

Gorbachev said he does not see the implementation of tough measures as giving "any cause for concern".

Lukyanov Highlights Labor Legislation Conflict

LD2804064191 Moscow Central Television Second Program Network in Russian 1848 GMT 26 Apr 91

[Address by USSR Supreme Soviet Chairman Anatoliy Lukyanov to the USSR Supreme Soviet in the Kremlin on 26 April; from the "At the USSR Supreme Soviet" program—recorded]

[Text] The next question is highly unusual for the Supreme Soviet, I would say. This is the first time we have encountered such a situation. What's more, this situation is regulated by the Constitution. We are to consider a submission by the USSR president, who, under Paragraph 8 of Article 127/3 in the Constitution, has the right to return a law which has been submitted to him for signature, to ask the Supreme Soviet to examine it again and take another vote. I earnestly request the Supreme Soviet to listen to this attentively because the situation is unusual, and we will gradually have to accustom ourselves to this situation.

The Supreme Soviet adopted a law on amendments and additions to USSR labor legislation. We adopted it after a vote which was preceded by considerable argument. We forwarded it to the president for signature. That was on 11 March this year, and now the president has returned the law unsigned. The document has been distributed to you. There were the following reasons for returning the law for further discussion and voting. They are set out in the president's memorandum. Among other things, Paragraph 2 in Article 1 of this law amends the wording of Article 18 in the principles of legislation on labor questions. The new wording of this article is as follows: An objection by a trade union committee—and this article deals with dismissals—an objection by a trade union committee to the severing of a labor contract does not constitute a barrier to the issuing of an order on the dismissal of a worker. In other words, management may dismiss a worker even if a trade union committee is opposed to the action.

In his submission, the USSR president says that the new wording of Article 18 first—comrades, please pay attention—first contradicts Article 8 of the law on trade unions and their rights and guarantees, which came into force on 1 January 1991. I remind you that, according to this law, management may dismiss a worker only if agreement has first been secured from the trade union committee. We adopted this law ourselves. It came into force on 1 January. Second, in the president's view, the amendment of previous procedures for the severing of a contract under Article 18 is not expedient, since the participation of trade union committees in deciding questions involving dismissal acts as an additional guarantee that the constitutional right of citizens to work will be protected. When I spoke to Mikhail Sergeyevich, he said that the situation is difficult. The dismissal of a worker could mean joblessness. Here, we must think over and over again how the rights of the working man will be protected.

It should be mentioned that when the Soviet Union examined the draft law on 11 March, we did not overlook the contradiction between Paragraph 8 in the trade union law and Article 18 in the principles of labor legislation. You remember how much we discussed this question and how we voted. Various views were expressed at that session. Eventually, we adopted a decision on the procedures for bringing the law into force in which Paragbraph 6 instructed the Ministry of Labor and Social Affairs, the Supreme Court, the Procuratorate, and the Justice Ministry, together with the Council of General Confederation of Trade Unions, to study the experience gained from the application of labor legislation and to report on the results to the Supreme Soviet by 1 January 1992. That was what we agreed on at that time. It was a kind of compromise, so to speak. That, very briefly, is the essence of the question on which the Supreme Soviet must decide.

How can it be decided? The Supreme Soviet may confirm the decision which we adopted, but if we do this, it must, without fail, be by a majority of two-thirds in each chamber. This is what the Constitution requires. If the president does not sign a draft law but returns it for reworking and further examination, and we do not agree with the president's view, we must achieve a majority of two-thirds in each chamber. It must be pointed out that if we do decide to confirm it, the contradiction with the new law on trade unions will remain. Therefore, Paragraph 6 in our decision does not remove this contradiction. It merely puts off the solution of this question. Therefore, in general, one should regard the president's criticism as being justified.

It seems to me that we should hear the committee's view on this question. However, opinions within the committee were divided. Therefore, the following option is possible: Either we amend Article 8 in the trade union

law and bring it into conformity with the new wording of Article 18 of the principles of labor legislation, or we amend the wording of Article 18 of the principles so that it conforms with the regulations established under the trade union law. That's the whole story, so to speak.

The entire file on this question has been carefully examined by a number of committees and commissions, including the Commission on Labor and Social Policy. In fact, I have just received another report on this question. It is signed by Comrade Tetenov, the chairman of the transportation committee.

Gorbachev Veto Discussed

LD2604163391 Moscow TASS in English 1540 GMT 26 Apr 91

[By TASS parliamentary correspondent Ivan Ivanov]

[Text] Moscow April 26 TASS—The USSR Supreme Soviet (parliament) has come up today against a situation without precedent of its two years of work. The Soviet president has not signed a law on amendments and supplements to basic legislation on labour of the USSR and Union republics adopted by parliament in March, and returned it for repeated consideration and voting.

Emphasising that this procedure is envisaged by the Constitution of the USSR, Anatoliy Lukyanov, chairman of the Supreme Soviet, said that the president had not agreed with the provision of the adopted law which gives the administration the right to dismiss an employee without the consent of an enterprise's trade union committee.

Lukyanov said the president had pointed out a contradiction between that article and the law on trade unions and their rights and guarantees of their activity, which had earlier been adopted by the Supreme Soviet. Under that law an employee can be dismissed only with a trade union's consent, as was before.

"Besides that the president believes that the introduction of the basic legislation on labour in new wording is inexpedient, since it can lead to added social tension," Lukyanov said. He noted that the requirement for a trade union's consent to an employee's dismissal is an additional guarantee of citizens' constitutional right to work.

Opposing opinions were stated during the debate. A number of deputies insisted on the viewpoint that the requirement for trade unions consent to dismissals can slow down the structural change of the economy and the shaping of market relations in the country.

Chairman of the parliamentary committee for legality and law Yuriy Kalmykov and USSR Minister of Justice Sergey Lushchikov have not agreed with the president. They stated that trade unions should not assume the functions of the court, and the administration of enterprises should have a right to decide matters of hiring and dismissal independently. On the other hand, it was said that there is a need for effective social protection of the working people during the period of transition, now that there is a growing threat of unemployment.

It has finally been decided to analyse the controversial question again and resume its discussion after the intermission in the work of parliament after holidays in May.

Besides that, the Supreme Soviet today adopted a law on administrative responsibility for the violation of rules, norms and insructions for safe conduct of work at enterprises and in organisations of the USSR Defence Ministry and the USSR Ministry of Atomic Energy and Industry.

The act stipulates managers responsibility in the form of high fines of officials for the violation of rules and norms of safe conduct of work at facilities of high risk.

President Gorbachev will address the session in the afternoon to sum up the results of his visits to Japan and South Korea.

Nuclear Safety Law Adopted

LD2604220891 Moscow All-Union Radio First Program Radio-1 Network in Russian 1900 GMT 26 Apr 91

[Text] Today the Union and Russian parliaments continued their work. People's deputies honored the memory of the victims of the Chernobyl catastrophe. The USSR Supreme Soviet adopted as a whole a law on administrative responsibility for violation of the rules, norms, and instructions for work safety at enterprises and organizations of the USSR Ministry of Defense and the USSR Ministry of Atomic Power.

In the afternoon there was discussion of the report by the USSR president on the results of his visit to Japan.

At a joint sitting of the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic [RSFSR] Supreme Soviet, a resolution was adopted on the agenda of the fourth Congress of People's Deputies of Russia. It includes four [as heard] questions: On the ratification of the RSFSR law on the president of the RSFSR; on amendments and addenda to the RSFSR Constitution in connection with the institution of the office of president of Russia; on candidates to the presidency of the RSFSR; on ratification of the law on the Constitutional Court of the Russian Federation; and on the election of the Constitutional Court of Russia.

Political & Social

Falin: Gorbachev Should Remain Party Leader

LD2704095891 Moscow All-Union Radio Mayak Network in Russian 0900 GMT 27 Apr 91

[Text] Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev's departure from the post of general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee would initiate processes of party disintegration.

That was how Falin, secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, answered a question from an RNA [RUSSIAN NEWS AGENCY] correspondent. In his view, this is not the time for leaving the post when it is necessary to extricate the country from its crisis.

President's Five-Point Crisis Program Lauded

PM2604093191 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 25 Apr 91 Second Edition p 2

["My Opinion" by Georgiy Ovcharenko: "Five Points of Accord"]

[Text] People have grown tired of the all-out confrontation in which the whole country is fatally engulfed today. Confrontation between political leaders, the war of laws and budgets, and real anarchy are having a destructive effect on the economy and on people's standard of living. The result is mistrust in the incumbent authority's ability to change things for the better and despair, inciting many many people to strike and acts of civil disobedience. Taking advantage of the sorry state of the country and its population, some people are now endorsing the following slogan among the masses: "The worse it is, the better." As happened in the past, certain forces would like to raze everything to the ground and then....

Then things will still be no better for people. Because, as history shows us, wreckers are unable to construct, they are unable to sacrifice their own ambition for the people's good—nor do they aim to do so.

It seemed yesterday that the wreckers would gain the upper hand over the creators. But today a ray of hope has gleamed in our life. Hope that we will move on from confrontation to accord, from destruction to construction.

This hope has been provided by the joint statement published by the USSR president and the leaders of nine Union republics On Urgent Measures To Stabilize the Situation in the Country and Overcome the Crisis. I don't know about anyone else but I read the long-awaited document with the feeling that a millstone of hopelessness had been lifted from around my neck.

I may meet with the objection: We know the price of all these urgent measures. People say, we've had Ryzhkov's schemes, the Yavlinskiy's and Shatalin's "500 Days" has well and truly disappeared, and Pavlov's prices that were supposedly inflated for the people's good have finished people off once and for all. That's all true. But one should not forget the main thing: All the most sensible suggestions—whoever made them—were obscured amid the war of laws and the political confrontation. Nothing should be built on the basis of unsound advice. And that's precisely what we've been doing of late.

That is why I personally see the joint statement issued by M. Gorbachev and the heads of the nine sovereign republics primarily as a step to accommodate the will of people who have begun to curse political confrontation, a step toward common sense and accord.

For me this document represents a step back toward constitutional order in the country. I do not think I am mistaken in saying that this is the main thing for us now. Legal nihilism that eats away at legality like rust has threatened to reduce people to a state of anarchy [bespredel]. That is why the sides' agreement to rigorously comply with existing laws until the new Union Treaty and new Union Constitution are adopted is a realistic means of restoring the disrupted economic, political, and social ties.

The prospect of concluding the Union treaty itself has also become clearer today. The joint statement says unequivocally that without it, without a new constitution, we will not escape from the crisis situation. In this connection the decision by the statement's authors to grant most-favored-nation status to signatories of the Union treaty within the framework of the single economic expanse that they will form sounds quite reasonable and advisable.

The joint statement contains five points. Each is topical and of vital importance for stabilizing the situation in the country and overcoming the current crisis. But the main thing is that all these points are linked by a desire for accord and cooperation.

While voting entirely in favor of this joint statement issued by the center and the republics and wholeheartedly wishing it to be implemented in full, I nonetheless am bound to voice one warning. The crux is that there have already been similar attempts to reach agreement. Many people will probably remember the economic treaty concluded between the center and the republics at the beginning of the year. It has, regrettably, suffered a sorry fate: It has remained just a piece of paper. Will the same thing happen to the latest document?.

I would not want that. Like everyone, I hope that the joint statement issued by the USSR president and the heads of the nine republics is not merely a declaration but a guide for concrete actions.

What next? I am sure that the answer to that question is unequivocal: Roll up your sleeves and get to work! Not everything will go smoothly, it will not prove possible to achieve all the plans straightaway, and there will be more disputes. But a start has been made. There is a hope that the country has gotten over the period of all-out confrontation. A period in which it sustained tremendous losses that are difficult to make good—but not to no avail.

Fokin Praises Outcome of Republican Meeting

LD2704152691 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1740 GMT 26 Apr 91

[UKRINFORM-TASS correspondents Sergey Bibik and Aleksey Trotsenko]

[Text] Kiev, 26 Apr—Ukrainian Prime Minister Vitold Fokin, has described the joint statement on urgent measures to stabilize the situation in the country and to overcome the crisis, adopted following the 23 April meeting between the USSR president and the leaders of the highest state bodies of the Union republics—Russia, Ukraine, Belorussia, Uzbekistan, Kazakhstan, Azerbaijan, Tajikistan, Kyrgyzstan, and Turkmenistan—as a document of extraordinary importance.

According to Vitold Fokin, the main result of the conference is that "mutual trust has been restored and old grievances have been forgotten". "We have all realized that we can only extricate ourselves from the crisis and negotiate the sharp twists and turns in the transition to market relations and provide a worthy future for our peoples if we pursue joint, coordinated efforts," he noted.

Vitold Fokin stressed that it was finally admitted at the meeting that "the new Union must be made up of sovereign states, and it is their delegations that are going to have to sign the new Union Treaty. Everyone was also in favor of substantial changes being made to the principles of drawing up the state budget."

"The participants in the meeting noted that it was necessary to strengthen the authority of the USSR president, ensuring that the decrees that he passes are not interpreted at will, and that order can be restored and legality strengthened in the country," Vitold Fokin said. "It must be remembered that the struggle currently under way cannot remain a bloodless one for long, and woe betide anyone who does not stop in time. The parties to the meeting managed to reflect on everything that is taking place and to overcome their pride in the interests of the people, our children, and our children's children. They managed to do all that," concluded the prime minister.

Shcherbakov Views Trade Union-Government Accord

LD2604111591 Moscow Central Television First Program Network in Russian 1905 GMT 25 Apr 91

[Interview with Vladimir Pavlovich Shcherbakov, chairman of the USSR General Confederation of Trade Unions, by commentator Sergey Medvedev; place and date not given—recorded]

[Excerpts] [Medvedev] A few days ago the Council of the General Confederation of Trade Unions [GCTU] and the USSR Cabinet of Ministers signed an agreement for 1991 on labor and socioeconomic issues. Vladimir Pavlovich Shcherbakov is one of those who signed the agreement on behalf of the trade unions.

Does this mean you have reached an accord with the Cabinet of Ministers?

[Shcherbakov] We have reached a certain accord. But this accord was preceded by very serious work. The work began immediately after our congress, with the Ryzhkov cabinet. Then the work was interrupted by the change of leadership in our Council of Ministers—we got the Cabinet of Ministers instead of the Council of Ministers. But we did not give up on the agreement. It underwent significant changes. In connection with the fact that on 2 April prices were raised sharply for many goods, practically for all goods, in connection with which the standard of living of the working people of the country, of all inhabitants of the country, droppd sharply, an extraordinary plenum, the second plenum, of the GCTU was convened and it adopted a decision, a decision consisting of nine points. These nine points are specific, they concern every Soviet man, and include, first, issues of insufficient compensation, issues of significant pay rises, issues of compensation for means at work for blue- and white-collar workers, for students, for school children. Also issues of compensation in connection with the sharp increases in the prices for vouchers and packages for sanatorium and health-resort treatment....

[Medvedev, interrupting] So these can be seen as issues of social protection.

[Shcherbakov] Precisely issues that concern every Soviet man, precisely social protection in this situation.

[Medvedev] So this agreement could be called a compromise, but does this mean that the government, let us say, has placated the trade unions?

[Shcherbakov] This is the first step, let us be candid, it is the first step in defending the working people's interests, because practically every layer of the population has suffered very significantly. And now we face a serious dispute, equally as concerns the rates agreements in every industry. And we have to achieve agreement—we have adopted a point like that—so that the decisions concerning the miners, adopted in early April, the Council of Ministers decisions, so that they apply to all basic industries. Because while the miners work underground, we also have people who extract ore, who work underground. For instance, in Selikamsk, say, the miners there come under the chemical industry, while these decisions only applied to the miners. [as heard] And we have achieved it so that these allowances also apply to workers in other industries. [passage omitted]

The vast majority of the points are specific: What is being done, by what date? This agreement is controlable. [passage omitted]

[Medvedev] So it could be said that this agreement is going to remove tension in many regions, in many collectives, even in many republics?

[Shcherbakov] Impulsive actions have never led to anything good. And impulsive strikes lead to great losses not only for the strikers themselves but also for people who work in associated enterprises. And we have strived and continue to strive for the trade unions to defend the interests of the working people on the legal, legislative, lawful basis. We have been given a law on trade unions and the rights are guarantees for their activity. And we

should act in the light of our constitutional rights, in the light of this agreement. That is how they act in all civilized countries. But we so far could not approach this. We have never... this is the first agreement we have managed to get, with difficulty.

[Medvedev] By the way, the agreement has been reached, it has been signed, but nevertheless strikes are under way in many regions. How do you explain this?

[Shcherbakov] I think that first, there is still no information about this agreement and it should now be published both in TRUD and other papers. The people will begin believing in this agreement when it's implementation begins. And the most important task is not—although this is the first important step that has been taken—not only to achieve the signing of this agreement. The most important thing is to implement it. So that the people feel it, so that the people know it, so that the people believe it, and then presumably the people will first of all come to the trade unions for the soluton of this or that problem.

[Medvedev] By the way, I would like to ask you the following: Who is going to monitor the implementation of the agreement? How is this going to be done? That is a very important question. The points themselves are fine, there is no questions about them.

[Shcherbakov] That is a very proper and essential question. For monitoring the implementation of this agreement and solving issues that arise in the course of its implementation, the USSR Cabinet of Ministers and the GCTU Council set up a commission. Full stop. The sides have agreed that the commission is chaired by two co-chairmen at the level of a USSR deputy prime minister and a USSR CSTU deputy chairman.

[Medvedev] Well, let us conjecture. A possible situation. One of the points is not implemented. The government does not implement it. What is to be done?

[Shcherbakov] There is a point here which says that the trade unions refrain from organizing strikes if this document is implemented. Well, if it is not implemented we will probably reserve the right to apply the appropriate measures of protest, that is appeals, negotiations, and, in the end, calls to strike. I think that it would not be desirable to get to that. The agreement should operate. And for the period of operation of the agreement there should be no strikes as such.

CPSU Military Policy Commission Meets

PM2804152191 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 27 Apr 91 Second Edition p 2

[V. Izgarshev report: "Party Concern for Conversion: From Sitting of CPSU Central Committee Standing Commission on Military Policy"]

[Text] A routine sitting of the CPSU Central Committee commission on the party's military policy was held yesterday. During the preparation for it the Central Committee's Socioeconomic Policy Department, together with the Military Policy Commission, conducted a detailed study of the work of the Udmurt Republic party organization in ensuring the implementation of conversion at the republic's defense industry enterprises.

Why Udmurtia? Because defense complex enterprises occupy a leading place in this developed industrial region. They constitute almost 70 percent of the industrial potential there. The conversion of defense production is being conducted very tangibly in the republic. Here is just one example. Whereas in 1988 defense output formed 69.7 percent of the total volume of production, and civilian and consumer goods production totaled 30.3 percent, in 1989-1990 the proportion of defense output fell to 46 percent while civilian and consumer goods production rose to 53 percent.

The reports of N. Sapozhnikov, secretary of the Udmurt Republic CPSU Committee, and L. Nikiforov, member of the CPSU Central Committee commission, comprehensively analyzed the tasks and practical activity of the republic party organization in implementing conversion. It was noted that almost one-third of the republic party organization's members work at defense enterprises. They are in all the key production posts. That should be the deciding factor in ensuring positive party influence on the elaboration and implementation of programs for the socioeconomic development of labor collectives in conditions of conversion.

At the joint plenum of the CPSU Central Committee and Central Control Commission it was rightly pointed out that communists must make paramount the people's interests and practical work to extricate the country from the crisis. Merely mouthing loyalty to the interests of the working class will not help. Communists must pay in full measure for the overtures made to the workers and must firmly implement what has been promised.

Unfortunately, it was stressed at the sitting, many party members are content to be passive and to wait for those at the top to suggest and resolve everything. This is one of the main reasons for many shortcomings—and not only in the republic party organization.

The commission adopted an extensive decision on the question under discussion. It makes recommendations to the Udmurt comrades and elaborates measures of unionwide significance. In particular, it is deemed necessary to strive for the adoption in the first half of the year of a USSR Law "On the Conversion of the Defense Industry" and a Law "On the Defense of the USSR" in conjunction with it.

Colonel General N. Shlyaga, USSR first deputy defense minister [title as published] and chief of the Armed Forces Main Military-Political Directorate, then delivered a report on the question of conclusions to be drawn from the results of the draft of citizens for active military service in 1990.

The sitting was conducted by commission chairman O. Baklanov.

Pavlov: Cabinet Refers to Sakharov, Solzhenitsyn

LD2804182291 Moscow Central Television Second Program Network in Russian 1716 GMT 28 Apr 91

[From the "Namedni" segment of "Author's Television" program presented by Leonid Parfenov]

[Text] [USSR Prime Minister] Valentin Pavlov has written a large article in OGONEK as a person whose activities have attracted most attention last month. Valentin Pavlov has put Sakharov and Solzhenitsyn at the top of the list of the authorities whose ideas the Cabinet [of Ministers] refers to.

While the Union prime minister is speaking highly of Solzhenitsyn, and an invitation to visit the Russian premier has been turned down by the writer, we can only show you this old film of him together with a foreign premier. [Video, taken many years ago, shows Margaret Thatcher receiving Solzhenitsyn in Downing Street]

TASS Reviews Press for 27 Apr

LD2704064391 Moscow TASS in English 0555 GMT 27 Apr 91

["Soviet Press Review"—TASS headline]

[Text] Moscow April 27 TASS—Today's newspapers open their front pages with reports about a joint plenum of the Soviet Communist Party Central Committee and the Central Control Commission.

The plenum passed a resolution "On the Situation in the Country and Ways to Pull the Economy Out of Crisis", "On Communists' Work in Councils of People's Deputies", an address to the Soviet people on the occasion of International Solidarity Day on May 1 and an address on the occasion of the fifth anniversary of the Chernobyl nuclear disaster.

PRAVDA publishes party General Secretary Mikhail Gorbachev's closing speech at the plenum.

RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA carries comments on the plenum by publicist Anatoliy Yurkov. Mikhail Gorbachev did not quit the post of party general secretary, did he win or lose? he asks.

SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA publishes Russian Communist Party Chief Ivan Polozkov's speech at the plenum, "tough and aimed personally against Mikhail Gorbachev", according to RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA, a statement by Latvian party leader A.P. Rubiks and N.N. Korablev of the Leningrad city party organisation.

RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA carries Prime Minister Valentin Pavlov's report at the plenum "On the Situation in the Country and Ways to Pull the country out of Crisis".

PRAVDA publishes Gorbachev's speech before the Soviet parliament on the results of his visits to Japan and Korea.

Newspapers carry President Mikhail Gorbachev's call on foreign governments to get involved intellectually and financially in an international World Health Organisation programme to study medical aspects of the Chernobyl nuclear accident.

TRUD reports about Friday's protest action across the country.

PRAVDA writes about a wave of anti-communism that has swept East European countries.

Newspapers report a three-and-a-half-hour spacewalk by cosmonauts Viktor Afanasiyev and Musa Manarov on Friday.

SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA writes about the spring sowing campaign.

KRASNAYA ZVEZDA and KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA write about ethnic tensions in northern Caucasus.

KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA publishes a photo report about the 1962 events in Novocherkassks.

RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA comments on the political situation in Kazakhstan and the republic's President Nursultan Nazarbayev.

PRAVDA comments on the Kurdish problem. It publishes an interview with South African Communist Party General Secretary Joe Slovo and covers Russian Prime Minister Ivan Silayev's visit to the United States.

SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA writes about the ethnic conflict on Cyprus.

RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA comments on the reasons of Slovak Prime Minister Vladimir Meciar's resignation.

TASS Reviews PRAVDA for 29 Apr

LD2904093391 Moscow TASS in English 0644 GMT 29 Apr 91

["Soviet PRAVDA Review"—TASS headline]

[Text] Moscow April 29 TASS—Today's PRAVDA completes the publication of speeches from the joint plenum of the Soviet Communist Party Central Committee and the Party Control Commission, held in Moscow on April 24 and 25.

The newspaper opens its front page with a comment by analyst Georgiy Ovcharenko on the joint statement by President Mikhail Gorbachev and leaders of nine Soviet republics on urgent measures to stabilise the situation in the country and overcome the crisis.

PRAVDA reports in detail about a congress of Lithuanian, Latvian and Estonian Communists in Riga on April 27. The meeting will help bolster the ties between Baltic Communists, it says.

It reports the ending of the third stage of the 29th Congress of the Armenian Communist Party in Yerevan. The meeting called on the republican party to reverse its decision to nationalise property belonging to the Communist Party.

The Soviet Communist Party Central Committee Standing Commission on Foreign Policy met in Moscow to discuss improving relations with other countries, PRAVDA reports.

PRAVDA carries extracts from an interview by Moscow Communist Party chief Yuriy Prokofyev with the U.S. Boston Globe newspaper.

Prokofyev blasted Mikhail Gorbachev and his aides and called for the resignation of Prime Minister Valentin Pavlov.

He blamed perestroika architects for disrupting the economy. "We are not in a stage of crisis, we are in a stage of catastrophe and society is on the brink of an explosion," Prokofyev stressed.

PRAVDA blasts the KURANTIY Moscow newspaper for its blatant anti- communism and attacks on Lenin, the Soviet Communist Party, the president and the government.

The newspaper carries an interview with Soviet Savings Bank board chairman Vladimir Khorkin about compensations to citizens following April 2 price hikes.

PRAVDA carries the programme of its festival, scheduled for May 3 and 4 in Moscow.

The newspaper carries a story about White House spokesman Marlin Fitzwater and an interview with him.

An editorial comment in PRAVDA criticises the United States and several of its western allies for "heightening tensions in northern Iraq" with their military presence in Kurdish refugee camps.

"Threatening to use force is not the best way to help refugees. This will hardly help settle the Kurdish issue, especially in light of progress reached at talks in Baghdad (between the Iraqi Government and Kurdish leaders) and energetic efforts by the U.N. secretary-general," PRAVDA writes.

Faltering Reform, Gorbachev Status Viewed

PM2504151391 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 22 Apr 91 Second Edition p 2

[Article by Dr. of Juridical Sciences Robert Yengibaryan: "Around the President"]

[Text] Public thought is today seeking answers to the question: Why has the process of our society's sociopolitical reformation become so catastrophically complex? For it had been reckoned that all that was needed for society's radical perestroyka was to open the sluice gates of democracy and glasnost and give more economic independence to regions, enterprises, cooperatives, and individuals, and the rest would happen of its own accord, with general prosperity ensuing without delay. The picture is different in practice.

The already low living standards of the long-suffering Soviet person have fallen disastrously. Society is threatened with serious upheavals, and the union state with disintegration. Interethnic contradictions have been exacerbated in the extreme and in individual regions have escalated into a real war. The traditional structures of vertical power, centralized management, and the center's relations with the regions have been seriously disrupted. In short, the sociopolitical crisis is obvious.

Our society has never been particularly noted for a critical attitude or sought within itself the reasons for its own humiliation and pitiable sociopolitical condition but has always appealed to the higher authorities or, to be more accurate, to the top person. Our people have always lived under the command of a personal authority—the tsar, the leader, the general secretary. This tendency has not been weakened during the Soviet period; if anything, the opposite....

In our country justice, the law, representative organs, and judicial power (I do not mean the punitive-repressive mechanism) have historically been ineffective and flabby and have served, rather, as a state-legal facade for the real power of the top person.

The inertia of historical thinking, the people's mentality nurtured in the spirit of paternalism (father, tsar, leader and father, good chief), and the subsequent ideological deifications made the citizen totally dependent on his leaders and commanders.

A considerable role in strengthening this mentality in broad sections of the population was also played by the fact that there was no legal democratic path for acceding to and departing from a leading post, still less the top post in the state. As our history shows, the top persons who stood at the pinnacle of the state acceded to power under circumstances independent of the population and could also be removed from power without its participation or consent, as a consequence either of radical social upheavals (Nicholas II) or of natural causes—death, illness—(Lenin, Stalin, Brezhnev, Andropov, Chernenko) or of a coup d'etat (Khrushchev).

Therefore perestroyka means not only the democratization of state-legal institutions and a switch to new forms of management, to market relations, etc. It means a profound reexamination—from democratic, civilized positions within the people's mentality—of the role and place of the top person (on a corresponding scale) in the sociopolitical life of the country and of his accountability

to society, which is able to decisively influence his activity and his political career. And it is particularly important that the foundation of the constitutional continuity of power is being laid right now in state life, by creating a corresponding political-legal precedent. At the same time it is significant that the country's present leader himself stands at the source of the creation of a precedent for the political-legal limitation of what was only yesterday the boundless power of the state's top official and for the establishment of a clear-cut term of his powers and his accountability to the country's top representative organs.

I am not sure how apt this comparison is, but never in our country's long history, in my view, has any of the state's top persons voluntarily had recourse to such a step but, on the contrary, has resisted this as far as possible. For it is undoubtedly considerably harder to govern using democratic methods than on your own!

At the same time it is still rather early today to speak of changes in the public awareness of the role and place of a leader, still less the top leader, in the sociopolitical life of the country. Political life, trends, and movements are exaggeratedly personified in the public awareness. Not only as a consequence of the fact that public awareness is predisposed to just this way of thinking but also, to a greater extent, "thanks" to the efforts of newly emerged political movements and their leaders, who associate the failures of perestroyka, particularly in the social sphere, chiefly with the person of the president.

The pretensions of a sizable section of state and party workers, particularly of the middle-regional link, amount virtually to this, but from opposite positions. Here, whereas the former accuse the president of concentrating great power in his hands and not letting the "democrats" develop themselves, the latter maintain the exact opposite—that he has groundlessly decentralized power and does not make full use of it. The former, conventionally "democrats," have mounted a broad, hysterical, stormy campaign, while the latter are accustomed to edict methods of activity and to rigid discipline and, on receiving virtually no orders from above and from the general secretary personally, have substantially lost the initiative and are in an enforced state of despondent expectation. Broad sections of the public in turn personify and associate the possibility of positive changes with the personal qualities of the president or, today, of his chief opponent—B.N. Yeltsin.

Many people today are amazed at the "phenomenon" of B.N. Yeltsin, whereas just two or three years ago they were amazed on a still greater scale, including abroad (which has proved more stable in its sympathies), at the "phenomenon" of M.S. Gorbachev.

In my view, if there is anything to be amazed at, it is exclusively the phenomenon of that part of our society which has once again decided to put its trust not in the social-legal and democratic institutions of a civilian society but in one man and his will and wishes.

But the political realities of the day are such that there is a continuous polarization of political forces, and society has been split into sections which increasingly detest each other. And the most significant thing is that the watershed is largely defined not by ideological program considerations but by personal sympathies and antipathies toward one leader or another.

M.S. Gorbachev is undoubtedly an extraordinary, outstanding political figure, and so radical positive changes on a world scale are linked with his name. Much has been written about him, and he will long remain one of the most popular political figures of modern times. It is possible to argue endlessly about the correctness and the scientific and practical validity of his political course. There are and can be no unequivocal assessments here, for they are too contradictory on the tactical and strategic plane, for example.

Many of us have hardly any doubts about the need for and the positive nature of the changes taking place on the strategic plane, but on the tactical plane it is possible to criticize severely the activity of the present and former composition of the country's leadership, the actions of the inconsequential "democrats" opposed to them, and the president personally for the depressing failures of perestroyka. In short, there are as many subjective and objective factors as you like. But, as a consequence of the decisive role—fixed in the public awareness—of the top state person in our society, it directed its gaze precisely toward him, and explanations will hardly be of any help here.

When we and the whole world spoke of Gorbachev as the initiator of perestroyka, we were in no way acting against our conscience but were really reflecting our reality, where the country's top official had such a fatefully decisive influence on social processes. The attempt to change public ideas at once and abruptly through 180 degrees is evidently doomed to failure. Therefore a considerable part of our public and the foreign public associates the possibility of leading the country out of a most severe sociopolitical and moral-spiritual crisis precisely with Gorbachev—the state's top person.

When tragic events occur in the country in peacetime, accompanied by numerous human casualties, mass terror, the forcible deportation of thousands of people, and their turning into refugees without rights in their own country, when chaos reigns and authority has been paralyzed, millions of people ask a legitimate question: Where are authority and the president? Do they not wish or are they unable to prevent this utter confusion?

The authorities have to make an ignoble choice: to reject the virtually criminal "they do not wish" and, as a result, resign themselves to the pitiful "they are unable...."

However, the 17 March all-union referendum and the events in Moscow 28 March this year clearly showed that the union power and the president have more than enough forces and broad popular support not only to maintain public order but also to pursue a purposeful

political course. Consequently, when it is a question of human lives, like the current events in South Ossetia and in Karabakh, people have a right to expect the authorities to provide reliable protection by engaging the entire might of the state mechanism without delay.

Indecision undoubtedly undermines the prestige of the central authorities and of the president personally, from whom people expect decisive and consistent actions of both a political-legal and an economic nature. The time of grandiose political measures, the search for new ideological concepts, and efficacious international meetings and "roundtables" is past. People are most interested in their daily life and the economic situation in the country. They will not forgive the authorities and the president for the chronic failure to keep pace with rapidly developing social processes. The people's energy, mainly aroused by him—the initiator of perestroyka—demands action. And God forbid that it should not find a practical application in a society torn by multiple contradictions and take the wrong path.

One should be more precise when speaking of the confrontation between M.S. Gorbachev and B.N. Yeltsin. Yeltsin confronts Gorbachev, while the political movement which Yeltsin heads, whose nucleus is "Democratic Russia," confronts central, union structures and the CPSU.

This confrontation is none other than a direct result of a definite crisis of power and of the former social and ideological values advocated by the CPSU. In many ways it is of an unlawful nature and is based on insubordination to central union structures and legislation.

B.N. Yeltsin is a creation of perestroyka itself and of its initiator. For the first time in our history a disgraced politician was not turned into a political corpse—not in the literal physical sense either. Moreover, he was enabled to engage in political activity and even—something inconceivable just a few years ago under our decrepit leaders—to oppose the state's top official. Of course, there was nothing criminal in this; on the contrary, there was a glimmer of hope that the foundations of healthy political competition were being laid.

However, B.N. Yeltsin very soon introduced into this struggle not only skills acquired in previous party work but also personal qualities: the utmost confrontation and rigid implacability, and disregard for moral and legal norms and human dignity.

At the same time, whereas a couple of years ago his pretensions to a leading role in the country had no real basis to them and were not taken at all seriously, today, against a background of the dynamic development of social processes, such pretensions are becoming increasingly real.

It has to be stated with great regret that the politically active part of our society, the newly appeared sociopolitical movements, and their chief leader today have been unable to organize themselves into a civilized opposition acting within the framework of the law and the constitution. Instead of developing alternative, positively pragmatic, creative activity, Yeltsin and his associates, true to home-grown political traditions, at once entered into a tough political struggle for power. You get the impression that the struggle is not of a political nature but is being waged to divide up the state and its property.

Thus, the watershed separating the forces which support the central power, the president, and the CPSU from the opposition forces confronting them has become clearly apparent. The struggle of ideas and programs, which is natural for democratic societies, on Soviet soil is increasingly assuming the nature of an implacable personal struggle for the purpose of overthrowing one's opponent at all costs and, at the same time, concentrating as much power as possible in one's own hands. It is interesting that, despite a lower cultural and intellectual standard, compared with M.S. Gorbachev, the ill-concealed authoritarian, contradictory, and poorly reasoned nature of his policies, his highly disconcerting unpredictability, and his overt populism, the influence and number of B.N. Yeltsin's supporters were growing rapidly until recently.

Where is the enigma? Maybe it is to do with our people's political naivety and their traditionally skeptical attitude to the official authorities and to good education and the intelligentsia? The answer is simple. Yeltsin is gaining points and political weight from the generous leaven of the mistakes and the indecisive and half-hearted nature of the actions of the authorities and the president. There is growing public indignation and tiredness with everything that is happening and with the Gorbachev-Yeltsin confrontation. Many people tend to the conclusion that their departure from the political arena is the optimum option for defusing the menacingly thickening political atmosphere in the country.

We have all ended up hostages of our political traditions, way of thinking, and political standards. A rhetorical appeal to the people's wisdom and reason and to the public's initiative and independence is not entirely convincing in our case and is of little consolation. I am profoundly confident that the country's first state official, his way of thinking, and his political sophistication will play a determining role in the life of us all until our society becomes a civilian-legal society, with the individual's unshakable sociopolitical and democratic rights. M.S. Gorbachev will now be able to do more than the state-legal institutions which have not yet become firmly rooted in the new democratic soil. During the time remaining until his constitutional powers run out he must place on a firmer basis the practical realization of the reform which he began, save his reputation as a great innovator, and, in the final analysis, help society to emerge from the severe crisis.

Moscow Warning Strike Lacks Support

LD2604124191 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1214 GMT 26 Apr 91

[Text] Moscow, 26 Apr (TASS)—The appeal by the Independent Federation of Trade Unions of Russia [IFTUR] to stage a one-hour warning strike today did not, on the whole, meet with support among the work forces of the capital. A TASS correspondent was told this at the section in charge of protecting the economic interests of the working people of the Moscow Trade Union Federation. Rallies in support of the IFTUR's economic demands took place during the lunch break only at individual enterprises, such as the "Izmerite" scientific and production association, the IsNIITMash [Central Scientific and Research Institute of Heavy Machine building], and some others. Those who spoke at the rallies called on the working people of the capital to step up their struggle for peace and civic consensus and to show their solidarity with these demands at Moscow's Red Square on 1 May.

Ban on Armed Formations Reviewed

LD2704171391 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1645 GMT 27 Apr 91

[Text] Moscow, 27 Apr (TASS)—The progress in implementing the decree of the USSR President of 25 July 1990, on "banning the setting up of armed formations not provided for by USSR legislation, and the confiscation of arms in cases of their illegal possession" by internal affairs bodies and internal troops was examined on Friday at a sitting of the collegium of the USSR Internal Affairs Ministry [MVD], it was announced at the news center of the USSR MVD.

It was noted that work on implementing the decree has become somewhat more vigorous. It is being carried out actively in the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic, Kazakhstan, Uzbekistan, and the Ukraine. However, in a number of regions of the country, above all in the Transcaucasus, illegal paramilitary structures continue to operate and the confiscation of illegal arms, ammunition, and explosives is not being implemented satisfactorily.

The collegium submitted a number of additional measures to strengthen law, order, and legality, and to intensify operations connected with fulfilling the demands of the presidential decree, and also with improving cooperation in this work between all law enforcement bodies, the population, and the public.

Moscow City Federation Issues May Day Appeal

LD2504170991 Moscow All-Union Radio Mayak Network in Russian 1500 GMT 25 Apr 91

[Text] A rally organised by the City Federation of Trade Unions, with the participation of the Association of Free Trade Unions of the RSFSR will be held in Moscow's Red Square on 1 May. Democratic Russia has withdrawn its applicaiton for a May Day rally, and decided to hold it earlier, on 29 April. Our correspondent received this information at today's session of the May Day organizational committee.

The city federation's appeal to parties and political movements stresses that throughout the world, 1 May is recognized as a trade union holiday, and it appeals for the essence of the day not to be distorted by political manifestations, but to hold the rally as an action to express the socioeconomic demands of working people. Leaders of the state and of the trade union movement from all country's republics are invited to Red Square as guests.

Further on Republic Interparliamentary Conference

PM2504155991 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 24 Apr 91 Union Edition p 4

[Viktor Litovkin report under the rubric "Direct Line": "Democrats Have Coordinated Policy"]

[Text] Moscow—The Interparliamentary Conference of supreme soviets' factions and groups has been held in Moscow.

Participating in the conference were 27 factions and groups from Azerbaijan, Armenia, Belorussia, Kyrgyzstan, Moldova, the Russian Federation, Tajikistan, Uzbekistan, the Ukraine, Estonia, and Tatarstan. Observers from Latvia, Lithuania, and Georgia attended. The conference turned out to be a small one. Certain republics, particularly Central Asian ones, were represented by just one or two people.

The documents adopted at the conference cover quite a wide range of problems of concern to society. Thus, the conference declared its support for the strike movement, called for a "roundtable" of political forces to be set up, advanced an initiative to hold an interparliamentary conference on the republics' security and cooperation, supported the draft Treaty on a Community of Sovereign States, and confirmed the Interparliamentary Conference as the permanently operating consultative organ of democratic factions and groups.

The Interparliamentary Conference declared as its chief aim "the consolidation of parliaments' efforts for the peaceful and civilized dismantling of the totalitarian regime and imperial structures, the creation of sovereign democratic states, and the setting up of mutually advantageous relations in various spheres of life." The main forms of work proposed are "the regular and mutual exchange of information, the coordination and elaboration of positions, joint parliamentary actions, the formation of joint commissions to study various problems and prepare drafts of multilateral treaties, other kinds of actions..."

It was decided to convene an international interparliamentary conference next September.

Public Order Reportedly 'Considerably Worsened'

LD2204214791 Moscow TASS in English 2130 GMT 22 Apr 91

["Soviet Deputy Interior Minister on Public Order in USSR"—TASS headline; by TASS correspondent Aleksandr Borisov]

[Text] Moscow April 23 TASS— "It is doubtful that public order will improve in the Soviet Union in the near future," Soviet First Deputy Prime Minister [title as received] Boris Gromov said on Monday.

Gromov addressed a meeting of representatives from police units responsible for ensuring public order from all republics.

The state of public order is being considerably worsened by social and political instability in the country, Gromov said. Speaking about the situation in South Ossetia, Gromov noted that the conflict there is political, rather than inter-ethnic.

Gromov believes that the situation in North Ossetia is even more complicated than in South Ossetia. If inter-ethnic problems there are not resolved, the situation could result is an inter-ethnic conflict embracing all the north Caucasus, and its consequences are hard to predict.

Gromov said he was particularly worried with the fact that despite measures taken, street crime rate is still growing. He said some 17 to 20 per cent of crimes are being committed in the streets of cities and settlements. Such crimes are becoming more and more impudent and cruel.

More often, criminals resist policemen and use weapons, while they are being detained. According to the Soviet Interior Ministry, last year, over 7,000 crimes were committed with the help of weapons. In this connection, Gromov recalled that 12,000 firearms are being searched for.

Gromov said 22 policemen were killed and 91 wounded in the first three months of 1991. Policemen were forced to use weapons 264 times for self-defence and to avert crime.

Joint patrolling by policemen and the army is being conducted in nine republics, and 10,000 to 12,000 people are taking part in patrols, Gromov said. Since patrolling began, they averted tens of thousands of crimes and detained 437 criminals.

New Asia-Pacific Department Established

LD2404135591 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1315 GMT 24 Apr 91

[Report by TASS correspondent Igor Peskov]

[Text] Moscow, 24 Apr (TASS)—Planning of Soviet foreign policy in the Asian-Pacific region, study of political, economic, and military aspects of the situation in that region of the world, and establishment of cultural and humanitarian cooperation between countries—such are the main tasks of a new department of the USSR Foreign Ministry, the Administration of General Problems of the Asian-Pacific Region [Upravleniye Obshchikh Problem Aziatsko-Tikhookeanskogo regiona]

The need to set up such a department, its head Aleksandr Losyukov commented in conversation with the TASS correspondent, is dictated by the emergence over recent years of new elements in the development of the situation in the Asian-Pacific region, and new approaches by the Soviet side to the region's problems.

From the very start of the administration's activities it became clear that the situation in the Asian-Pacific region differs in many respects from the situation on the European continent and in other regions. Separate "political zones" such as ASEAN [Association of South-East Asian Nations], Australia, Japan, China and others exist in the Asian-Pacific region. The main issue, in the Soviet diplomat's view, is the quest for points of contact between these.

Proceeding from this, Soviet diplomacy sees one of its tasks to be the study of opportunities for creating a consultative-negotiating process in the region, which could reveal common approaches by the Asian-Pacific region countries to various problems, with the aim of turning the region into a zone of stability and security, where the emergence of conflict situations would be impermissible, and where the existing conflicts would be resolved by peaceful means.

We are not talking about holding some sort of region-wide forum straightaway, Aleksandr Losyukov said. In his view, the process must be a gradual, multistage one, and must proceed from simple forms to more complex ones. In this regard, he commented, the idea mooted during the USSR president's visit to Japan, about holding a five-party meeting on the problems of the northern sector of the Pacific, is the first step to a multilateral dialogue between the countries of the region. The USSR believes, in general, that in proceeding to an all-embracing process of negotiations on the future of the Asian-Pacific region, in which the majority of the states of the region would be involved, there is no need to break the existing negotiating structures, such as bilateral and group contacts. "In Tokyo we did not try to put forward any completely new program, but wanted to demonstrate our commitment to the negotiating process in the region as a whole," Aleksandr Losyukov stressed.

Economic

Striking Miners Begin Returning to Work

LD2704060691 Moscow All-Union Radio Mayak Network in Russian 0500 GMT 27 Apr 91

[Text] Our Vorkuta correspondent reports that besides the Vorgashorskaya mine, which has been working continuously, eight more mines started work today as of

0000, beginning with the night shift. Their collectives have accepted the transferring of the mines to Russia's jurisdiction to be sufficient grounds for discontinuing the strike. Miners at four mines—Severnaya, Oktyabrskaya, Zapolyarnaya, and Yunyaga—have not started work yet. Our correspondent could not find the reasons for their not resuming work, but as Stanislav Kaminskiy, a worker at the Komsomolskaya mine, told our correspondent, it is easy to start a strike but difficult to end it.

In Kuzbass, over 60 party committees have found themselves removed from the enterprises' premises. The Zapadno-Sibirskiy metallurgical combine was depoliticized a few days ago. As the SIBINFORM correspondent was told at the oblast strike committee, the party committees will be withdrawn from the majority of the striking mines.

Kuzbass Miners' Strike Crumbles

LD2704105191 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0715 GMT 27 Apr 91

[By TASS correspondent Grigoriy Shalakin]

[Text] Kemerovo (Western Siberia), 27 Apr (TASS)—Miners of all coal enterprises with no exceptions, of the town of Mezhdurechensk in the Kuzbass halted their political strike, which went on for more than a month and a half, and resumed work today. This fact characterizes the beginning of a reduction in the miners' strike in the region, where many socioeconomic problems have accumulated.

Mezhdurechensk is the largest fuel supplier in the Kuznetsk coal field. About 22 million tonnes of coal is extracted each year in this town.

The number of mines which are idle is decreasing in the town of Belovo. For the first time in a long time the number of non-working mines in the Kuzbass has fallen below 40. Nevertheless, it is too early to speak about a recession of tension here. The lag in coal extracting continues to increase and as a result consumers have not received 4.7 million tonnes of coal in April.

It became known today that by agreement with Aman Tuleyev, chairman of the Kemerovo Oblast Soviet, Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic Supreme Soviet Chairman Boris Yeltsin will arrive in the Kuzbass on Monday.

Nine Vorkuta Mines Suspend Strikes

LD2704154191 Moscow TASS in English 1532 GMT 27 Apr 91

[By TASS correspondent Viktor Makarov]

[Text] Vorkuta, Komi Republic April 27 TASS—Nine coal mines suspended the strike here today. The labour collective of the Vorshagorskaya mine, the largest in the Pechora coal field, is not taking part in the strike. It withdrew from the Vorkutaugol Production Association and acquired a certain degree of economic independence. Three Vorkuta mines—Severnaya, Oktyabrskaya and Zapolyarnaya—are continuing the strike today.

Viktor Kolesnikov, chairman of the Vorkuta strike committee, told TASS that the decision to suspend the strike was taken for the following reasons. The need emerged to remove coal from some faces in order to prevent accidents there and keep mines in a working condition. Coal reserves at coal yards are being depleted. Vorkuta miners promised, at the request of the Russian Federation authorities, to deliver no less than 20,000 tonnes of coal a day to the Cherepovets metallurgical complex. Coal reserves should be replenished, so that they can keep their promise. A report that came from Moscow about the reaching of agreement in principle between the federal and Russian governments on the transfer of the Vorkutaugol Association to the jurisdiction of Russia also promoted the decision. A special commission, which includes representatives of Vorkuta miners, is now discussing in Moscow the terms of the transfer. In accordance with the results of its work, miners will decide whether to resume the strike or not.

According to Kolesnikov, Vorkuta miners are not withdrawing their demands and are continuging the struggle for their fulfilment. The principal demands are the dissolution of the Soviet parliament and the immediate adoption of a general tariff agreement.

The damage inflicted by the strike of Vorkuta miners continues to grow. Coal output of Vorkutaugol fell short of production targets by one million tonnes in March-April. Overall losses caused by the strike exceeded 170 million roubles and continue to grow rapidly.

Military

First Deputy Defense Minister Removed

LD2604201891 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1938 GMT 26 Apr 91

[Text] Moscow, 26 Apr (TASS)—USSR President Mikhail Gorbachev today issued a decree on the release of Army General Petr Lushev from his duties as USSR first deputy defense minister and commander in chief of the Joint Armed Forces of the Warsaw Pact member states in connection with his transfer to other work.

Swedish Army Commander Arrives for Visit

Meets With Moiseyev

LD2204214391 Moscow TASS in English 2120 GMT 22 Apr 91

[By TASS correspondent Oleg Moskovskiy]

[Text] Moscow April 22 TASS—Swedish Armed Forces Commander-in-Chief General Bengt Gustafsson today arrived in the Soviet Union on an official visit.

Head of the Soviet Armed Forces General Staff General of the Army Mikhail Moiseyev met him at the airport.

Later in the day, Gustafsson and Moiseyev met to discuss a broad range of issues of mutual interest.

"Today, we are beginning the construction of a nuclear-free and non-violent world. Sometimes, this process is hampered by suspicion, distrust, the lack of good will and well-considered assessment of events and account of the interests of partnership," Moiseyev told TASS after the meeting.

He said Gustafsson's visit is considered by the Soviet military leadership as "an important event" in the process of developing regular contacts between the two countries' armed forces. "It is pleasant that the visit is being held within the framework of strengthening mutual understanding and trust between the two states," Moiseyev said.

According to Moiseyev, the Soviet Union and Sweden established good-neighbourly relations long ago. The Soviet Union respects Sweden's "policy of non-alliance in the peace-time, aimed to retain neutrality in case of war," pursued for 170 years. "Over this period, relations between our countries have not been overshadowed by wars or military conflicts," Moiseyev said.

Moiseyev believes that practical steps by states "from being over-armed to defence sufficiency" is a necessary condition for making positive changes in the world irreversibile. He noted that the Soviet military reform is based on this principle in accordance with its defence doctrine.

"The reform is being steadily implemented. We are reducing the number of troops, producing a lesser amount of weapons and combat equipment, changing the structure of the military budget and pulling out troops from foreign states," Moiseyev said.

Holds Talks With Yazov

LD2304213791 Moscow TASS in English 1953 GMT 23 Apr 91

[By TASS correspondent Oleg Moskovskiy]

[Text] Moscow April 23 TASS—General Bengt Gustafsson, commander-in-chief of the Swedish Army, who is in the Soviet Union on an official visit, today visited the Kubinka Air Garrison near Moscow, where he familiarised himself with advanced military technology and saw demonstration flights.

On the same day the general visited a paratroopers training centre in Ryazan, central Russia. He showed interest in the training process, gave high assessment of the physical condition of cadets and their skills.

Later in the day, Soviet Defense Minister Dmitriy Yazov met General Gustafsson.

"We have discussed a wide range of issues, came to know each other better and, hopefully, attained better understanding," Yazov told TASS. "Being neighbours means not only living next door but also avoiding misunderstandings, conflicts and confrontation".

For his part, Gustafsson noted with satisfaction that Sweden and the USSR have no principled differences on the cardinal questions of modern international life. According to him, both Sweden and the Soviet Union stress the importance of making radical cuts in nuclear weapons, lessening the level of military confrontation and fostering a favourable international climate that will meet the interests of the two nations.

General Gustafsson laid wreath on the tomb of the unknown soldier at the Kremlin wall.

Baltic Republics

Communist Party Congress Held in Riga 27 Apr

Discuss 'Strategies'

LD2704100491 Moscow TASS in English 0945 GMT 27 Apr 91

[Text] Riga April 27 TASS—Communists from Lithuania, Latvia and Estonia are meeting here today to discuss Communist Party strategies in the Soviet Baltic republics.

A total of 300 delegates—a hundred from each republic—will discuss steps to keep the Baltic republics in the Soviet Union.

The congress is expected to be attended by Deputy Soviet Communist Party General Secretary Vladimir Ivashko and a delegation of the Russian Communist Party led by Ivan Polozkov.

The Ukrainian and Byelorussian Communist Parties have also sent in their representatives.

Coordinating Council Formed

LD2804042991 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1820 GMT 27 Apr 91

[By TASS correspondents Galina Kuchina and Valeriy Zaytsev]

[Text] Riga, 27 Apr (TASS)—Delegates to the congress of Baltic Communist Parties, which is continuing its work here, have devoted much attention to the Union treaty. They feel that it cannot be signed until the fate of each of the Union republics has been determined. In their view, this approach alone can guarantee protection for the rights of USSR citizens. It was felt necessary to "develop a movement in support of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia joining the Union treaty."

Participants in the congress, despite their ambiguous appraisal of the joint statement by the USSR president and the leaders of nine republics, supported it.

In the view of the delegates, the weakness of central authority dictates the need to create a single body that would help party members to unite efforts to oppose massive pressure being mounted with the assistance of state and legal machinery in the Baltic republics. To this end, a decision was made to form a coordinating council of Baltic Communist Parties.

One of the documents adopted by the congress protests attempts by Western states to interfere in the internal affairs of the Baltic republics. Delegates demanded that the USSR Supreme Soviet, the president, and the government of the country "take preventive measures limiting the scope of external diplomatic aggression."

CPSU Central Committee Secretary Valentin Kuptsov spoke at the congress.

Problems, Prospects Viewed

LD2804113991 Moscow All-Union Radio Mayak Network in Russian 0846 GMT 28 Apr 91

[Text] Our correspondent in Riga, Inard Skujins, has just been on the line to our studio. To start with, I would just like to remind you that the work of the congress of the Baltic communists came to a close in Riga yesterday. This morning, there was a news conference on its results. Inard Skujins was present, and now we will find out the details. Hello.

[Skujins] Hello. This morning a news conference was held, and the leaders of all three Baltic Communist Parties—the Communist Parties of Latvia, Lithuania and Estonia—Rubiks, Burokevicius, and Annus were present, as was Kuptsov, a CPSU Central Committee secretary. Melnikov and Lysovenko, secretaries of the Russian and Ukrainian Communist Parties, also replied to journalists' questions.

They evaluated yesterday's congress, giving what could be called its first results. The organizers of the congress consider that there was a useful exchange of views. In these conditions, with the communist parties of all three Baltic republics having lost power at the last elections, they find themselves today in opposition.

In the view of Rubiks, first secretary of the Central Committee of the Latvian Communist Party, the communists have again spoken of the violation of human rights on the part both of the legislative and executive bodies of authority. Second, Rubiks considers that the congress has spoken out loudly against interference by foreign states in the internal affairs of the Baltic republics.

In Burokevicius's view, the separatist forces are constantly coordinating their activities, therefore the communists also need to do this.

Speaking about the activities of communists in the Republic of Estonia, Annus emphasized in particular that the Communist Party will fight for power by civilized methods, and even today the Estonian communists are ready to participate in setting up a coalition government in the republic, which it would join. Kuptsov, secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, evaluated yesterday's congress as being the first experiment in the regional coordination of communist forces.

What do the leaders of the Communist Parties consider to be the most important activity of the Baltic communists in the immediate future? With one accord, they all stated that it is the battle for the masses, that is, work with the people, explaining their policy, working out new alternative programs, and preparing for the new elections.

Of course, today, the need to work for the signing of a new Union treaty was particularly emphasized. Burokevicius, leader of the Lithuanian communists, said that Lithuania is preparing a white book on the tragic pages

in Lithuanian history during the period of fascist occupation as well as the postwar period, and on the violation of human rights at the present time.

The communist leaders of all three parties, and also of Russia and the Ukraine, requested that journalists report the activities of the Baltic Communist Parties accurately and objectively.

Finally, the point which I would like to finish on. Presently, the secretaries of the Communist Party Central Committee are also meeting in Riga, and they are already discussing practical steps to implement the decisions of yesterday's congress of Baltic communists. On this note, I will finish.

Soviet-Lithuanian Talks Reportedly Set for May

LD2704100591 Moscow All-Union Radio Mayak Network in Russian 0900 GMT 27 Apr 91

[Text] The RUSSIAN NEWS AGENCY has received very important news from Vilnius. A new meeting of the Soviet and Lithuanian delegations will evidently take place next month. This was proposed, the BALTIYA agency claims, in a telephone conversation between Landsbergis, chairman of the Lithuanian legislature, and Doguzhiyev, the head of the Soviet delegation. Doguzhiyev also said there would be discussion of the Lithuanian side's proposal that they should meet in Vilnius this time.

Landsbergis, Doguzhiyev Discuss Bank Seizure

PM2604120191 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 26 Apr 91 Union Edition p 1

[Report by correspondent N. Lashkevich: "Special Purpose Militia Takes Bank Under Protection"]

[Text] During the daytime on Wednesday 24 April a group of armed members of the special purpose militia detachment occupied the building of the Novo-Vilnyaskiy branch of the Lithuanian Republic's agricultural bank and a commercial bank which had previously declared its subordination to the USSR banking system. The special purpose militia detachment penetrated the premises and set up a guard at the entrance. There was no clash with the police guarding the bank. It is believed that the purpose of seizing this institution was "to defend the property of the USSR." According to A. Azhubalis, a Lithuanian press spokesman, V. Landsbergis, chairman of the Lithuanian Supreme Soviet, in a telephone conversation with V. Doguzhiyev, USSR first deputy prime minister and leader of the Soviet delegation at the talks, voiced concern and pointed to the impermissibility of such actions, IZVESTIYA own correspondent N. Lashkevich reports.

Landsbergis Urges Non-Cooperation With Army

LD2804090391 Vilnius Radio Vilnius in Lithuania 0100 GMT 28 Apr 91

[Excerpt] [passage omitted] Speaking at the Sajudis rally in Independence Square on 27 April, Chairman of the legislature Vytautas Landsbergis described current Soviet tactics as observation of international reaction. Pressure is being increased through unceasing assaults, in order to be able to later switch to a major attack against Lithuanian independence and its government structures.

Discussing the damage inflicted on Lithuania by the foreign army, Vytautas Landsbergis noted that it has totaled 76 million rubles since January alone. That is why the question is raised of how we are to defend ourselves against the attackers. How should Lithuania defend itself if the military rule destroys legal authority?

The head of the legislature called attention to the fact that with active ongoing occupation, no one is to cooperate with the army hostile to us. This can be stated first in connection with the young men who are facing the spring draft into the Soviet Army.

Talking about the danger that has arisen for Lithuania and also about the situation within the Soviet Union itself, Vytautas Landsbergis noted that a decisive moment is approaching that will decide which way the scales will tip—toward real negotiations with Lithuania as a nation and state, who has chosen its path, or toward a path of economic, political, divisive, destructive and military force.

We must reply to all this with unity and agreement, on what we will support, and how we will support it, and we will truly support it to the end. Thus, it has been decided to agree on all this with the entire nation next week—most probably on Saturday—at a rally being organized by Sajudis in Vilnius.

Landsbergis Warns of Continuing Danger

LD2704173791 Vilnius Radio Vilnius in Lithuania 1600 GMT 27 Apr 91

[Report by correspondent Virginijus Miciulis from Vilnius' Independence Square on 27 April Sajudis rally]

[Text] I cannot tell exactly how many people have assembled in Independence Square today to meet with deputies elected by Sajudis. I can state that this square was filled today. People had assembled with tricolors and bouquets of spring flowers.

Deputies discussed only one topic: How are we to continue living under conditions of occupation? How are we going to oppose the occupiers, who are becoming increasingly wilfull every day in buildings they have occupied and who occupy new buildings?

Presently, the people are dispersing after the speeches.

The meeting was addressed by Professor Vytautas Landsbergis, chairman of the Supreme Council of Lithuania, who stated that the danger is far from past; it remains, it increases, and may even become greater. We must prepare for events perhaps even more horrible than those in the past, said Vytautas Landsbergis.

Sajudis Seimas Council Chairman Juozas Tumelis noted that Sajudis will invite all the people of Lithuania to a major meeting next weekend—it could be characterized as a gathering of the people from all over Lithuania. We will have to consult in the course of this meeting on how to behave in face of occupation, what we must do if a roundup of young men into the Soviet Army commences, and how we will act under conditions of a possible new blockade.

This meeting of the Lithuanian people will probably be held in Vingis Park. We will provide information about it separately.

Deputy Eugenijus Petrovas also spoke concerning the fact that no small trials, perhaps even major material shortages, await us. However, he invited us to decide whether we should proceed along the path of freedom to the end, or try to choose a more plentiful life.

Lithuania Threatens Separate Monetary System

LD2804023791 Vilnius International Service in Lithuanian 2100 GMT 27 Apr 91

[Text] The Lithuanian Government has issued a statement concerning the premises of the Lithuanian Agro-communal Bank in Naujoji Vilnija, which was occupied by Soviet soldiers this week. The statement notes that the commercial bank that has been established on the occupied premises has not been registered in accordance with the laws of the Lithuanian Republic and is functioning as a USSR bank.

Such activity by this commercial bank is illegal within the territory of the Lithuanian Republic. In addition, the Government of Lithuania has received information that this commercial bank is conducting accounting activity, issuing credits, and supplying cash to certain public organizations and their enterprises that are active in Lithuania but that are not registered according to the prescribed order. In this fashion, this bank is, in fact, carrying out another country's credit intervention, destroying the financial credit system of the Republic of Lithuania, increasing inflation, and aggravating the already difficult financial situation of the republic, notes the government statement. In protesting such activities by the USSR bank, the Lithuania Government declares that if the USSR Government does not employ the necessary measures to discontinue this illegal activity by the USSR bank, the Lithuanian Government will be forced to introduce a separate—that is, a Lithuanian Republic—monetary system.

Lithuanian Statement on Attacks on Property

LD2604104291 Vilnius Radio Vilnius in Lithuanian 0900 GMT 26 Apr 91

[Text] We received a statement by the Government of the Republic of Lithuania. I will read it:

On the night of 24-25 April soldiers of the USSR Armed Forces attacked the property of the state sport-technical organization Vytis; the technical schools in Siauliai, Kaunas, Alytus, Marijampole, Klaipeda, and Panevezys; the Signalas Hotel in Alytus; the Vilnius state enterprise Saulelydis; the Kiviskes and Palukne flying clubs; and the sport aviation enterprise in Prienai. They seized motor vehicles and heavy machinery belonging to these organizations, building cranes, motor vehicles tires, building materials, and tools. In some premises windows and equipment were smashed. Great material losses were inflicted by the soldiers' plundering. Officials at the attacked properties were intimidated and humiliated.

The Government of the Republic of Lithuania regards such actions of plundering and violating elementary legal norms as terrorist acts developing into extensive open violence against the Lithuanian state and its citizens.

On 24 April the first deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, the head of the delegation for negotiations with the Republic of Lithuania, Vitaliy Doguzhiyev, stated in a conversation with the chairman of the Supreme Council of the Republic of Lithuania, Vytautas Landsbergis, that there could not be talk about any use of force; problems should be solved by political means, by negotiation.

The events of the night of 25 April vividly demonstrate that one cannot believe the representatives of the USSR Government.

The Government of the Republic of Lithuania categorically protests against such actions by soldiers of the USSR Armed Forces violating law and order, increasing tension to the limits. It demands that the seized buildings and property be returned without delay.

The Government of the Republic of Lithuania states that whole responsibility for possible consequences rests with the USSR Government. If the rampaging by the military does not stop, it will not be able to guarantee that the citizens of the Republic of Lithuania do not take retaliatory actions.

Lithuanian, Soviet Officials Sign Protocol

LD2704100791 Vilnius International Service in Lithuanian 2100 GMT 26 Apr 91

[Text] Today in Vilnius, Lithuanian Internal Affairs Minister Marijonas Misiukonis signed a protocol on prospects for mutual cooperation with USSR Deputy Internal Affairs Minister Nikolay Demidov.

According to information supplied to Vilnius Radio by the government press bureau, the protocol provides for

opportunities to coordinate mutual actions in combatting organized crime and it notes the need for establishing a joint information system for criminal investigation.

Problems of escorting those arrested and those sentenced were also discussed at the working meeting. It was decided that the next meeting would take place on 1 July.

Following this [meeting], Marijonas Misiukonis and Nikolay Demidov were received by Lithuanian Deputy Prime Minister Zigmas Vaisvila.

RSFSR

Democratic Party Holds First Congress in Moscow

Backs Stability Statement

LD2604193691 Moscow TASS in English 1921 GMT 26 Apr 91

[Text] Moscow April 26 TASS—Nikolay Travkin, chairman of the Democratic Party of Russia, has described the joint statement on urgent measures for stabilising the situation and overcoming the crisis as an "appeal to common sense" and "the most satisfying event of the year." The statement was adopted on April 23 on the basis of the results of a meeting of the [USSR] president and leaders of nine Union republics.

Travkin is the head of the party, which is one of the biggest opponents of the ruling Soviet Communist Party. Its first congress opened in Moscow today.

He said today in a TV interview that the Democratic Party of Russia proclaimed itself to be a "central force between the left and right wings" of the Soviet Union's political spectrum. In the present situation, its main task is "not to allow processes to develop into something close to a civil war." According to Travkin, non-violence is the main slogan of the party.

Supports Yeltsin as President

LD2604135791 Moscow All-Union Radio First Program Radio-1 Network in Russian 1200 GMT 26 Apr 91

[Text] A program of action and the forthcoming election of a Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic [RSFSR] president are the focal points for the delegates to the congress of the Democratic Party of Russia, which opened today in the capital. A party spokesman has told a TASS correspondent that the congress is of a purely policy-making nature and is not connected with the sociopolitical situation in the country. According to preliminary information, the delegates will not support the decision to start a campaign to call an extraordinary congress of people's deputies, adopted by the seventh interdeputy (?meeting) of the Soyuz movement.

According to information obtained by a TASS correspondent, the delegates will evidently approve the election of Boris Nikolayevich Yeltsin, chairman of the republican legislature, to the post of president of Russia.

Ratifies People's Accord Bloc

LD2704181891 Moscow All-Union Radio First Program Radio-1 Network in Russian 1600 GMT 27 Apr 91

[Report by station correspondent Kirill Shakhnovich on second day of Democratic Party of Russia Congress, including recorded interview with Party Chairman Nikolay Ivanovich Travkin, place and date of interview not given]

[Text] The Democratic Party of Russia [DPR] was founded in May 1990. It now has 33,500 members. I remind you that at yesterday's session the delegates nominated Boris Yeltsin as the party's candidate for the post of president of Russia. They heard a report by Nikolay Travkin, the party chairman, and another report by Garry Kasparov, chairman of the Moscow organization. However, Kasparov and Arkadiy Murashev, prominent members of the DPR, no longer belong to the DPR. After their announcement that they were leaving the party, they stressed that they were asking supporters of their position to remain in the party until the Russian presidential election, and then to continue working from within the Democratic Russia movement, like themselves. In my view, the disagreement is of long standing. The reason for it is the hardline position taken by Nikolay Travkin toward opposition within the party, and also his new and milder anti-Communist views. Furthermore, in spite of solidarity with the miners, the position on the strike movement as a whole is not clear. Also today, the delegates ratified the declaration of a new bloc, People's Accord. It was signed by the leaders of the DPR, the Russian Christian Democratic Movement, and the Constitutional Democratic Party. According to the declaration, this is a constructive, democratic, right-of-center bloc within the Democratic Russia movement. In other words, this is an alliance of moderates and supporters of the Union and the dismantling of the CPSU. The congress will continue tomorrow. Now for a recorded extract from my interview with Nikolay Travkin:

Nikolay Ilyich, have the Party's views and ideology changed between the first, inaugural congress, and today's congress?

[Travkin] No, they have not changed. You cannot say that the party has changed its ideology. When it was first set up, there was a greater expression of emotion and hopes were greater. But that is another matter. We all thought that we would accomplish all this faster. We thought that if we brought all our weight to bear, everything would turn out fine tomorrow. Now we have realized that nothing can be done quickly. Apart from

anything else, it is becoming more and more important to prevent a development of events in the direction of bloodshed, let's say.

[Shakhnovich] That would be dangerous.

[Travkin] Yes.

[Shakhnovich] What will the party's future strategy and tactics be?

[Travkin] We are constantly stressing that the main moral slogan of the DPR is non-violence, and that we should check every move to make sure that it does not lead to some kind of explosion. If it might lead to an explosion, this means that such a move is not suitable for the party.

Rift Apparent at Congress

LD2604205691 Moscow TASS in English 2035 GMT 26 Apr 91

[Text] Moscow April 26 TASS—A delegate for a congress of the Democratic Party of Russia (DPR) likened the situation in the party to a fight of spiders in a jar. Indeed, the rift which was apparent prior to the forum became more pronounced after its opening today.

Not even the forming of the congress's working bodies passed smoothly. There were proposals to expel from the presidium Garry Kasparov, chairman of the Moscow organisation of the DPR. Differences cropped up on candidates to the secretariat, to the credentials and editing commissions.

During the break, the confrontation became more acute. Kasparov who appeared today in the role of a politician, not chess grandmaster, gave a news conference in the hall. It attracted a considerable number of delegates and reporters.

Kasparov dwelt on the basic differences with the chairman of the DPR, summed up an alternative programme worked out by a group of deputies and indicated that he is not going to beat a retreat.

Nikolay Travkin delivered a report after the intermission. Declaring that "the Soviet Communist Party's policy has suffered a fiasco," he set out a programme suggested by the DPR board. It envisages removing the Communist Party from power, electing as Russia's president a man who shares the views of the Democratic Party, and reelecting all the authorities where, as he said, "communists got entrenched" and where the most democratic laws will "get stalled".

The chairman also dwelt on the situation within the party. He said that the emergence of groups within the party leads to a split where the party will cease to exist.

Travkin summed up the party's immediate aims. They include the formation in Russia of an alliance of parties capable of crowding Communists at the elections, for, he believes, "the party will not be able to win the elections on its own." He said that the need to expand party membership is acute. According to him, the party has a membership of over 33 thousand.

Kasparov's supplementary report was more sharp and emotional. He said that many difficulties experienced by the party result form Travkin's policy. "What has been happening in the Democratic Party for eleven months hardly deserves to be described as democracy since the party rejects the democratic principle—the guarantee of minority rights."

These speeches largely determined the course of the congress. The delegates spent some time on discussing their preferences in the lobby.

The draft programme of the DPR proposed by the party's board was accepted in principle at the conclusion of the first day of the congress. The delegates nominated Boris Yeltsin, chairman of the Russian Parliament, as Russia's president.

Chairman Denies Split

LD2804172891 Moscow All-Union Radio First Program Radio-1 Network in Russian 1600 GMT 28 Apr 91

[Excerpts] The second congress of the Democratic Party of Russia has finished work in Moscow today. Here is our correspondent Kirill Shakhnovich:

[Shakhnovich] [passage omitted] Now listen to a fragment of my conversation with [Party Chairman] Nikolay Ilyich Travkin.

[Begin recording] Your attitude toward miners' strikes?

[Travkin] Our resolution was not to bring the whole economy to a standstill. The resolution states that we support the demands of the miners and support the aims of the workers' movement itself, including strike movement. And we do, indeed, support these aims. I would not say that this contains any deviations from the previously stated positions and guidelines of the Party. Nobody could dispute the fact that strikes in general are no way out. But, as a political party, the congress has supported the phenomena that are manifesting themselves through strikes. I would not say that we had any disagreements about this.

[Shakhnovich] I imagine that the day after the end of the congress, the press will be portraying it as yet another split in the democratic movement.

[Travkin] Of the delegates, only a couple have actually left. It would be an abvious exaggeration to use the word split here. Life is going on. The situation is changing. In accordance with the situation, people are defining their positions. As far as our aims are concerned, we have no disagreements. As to the tactics, here we have serious disagreements. And so what? Still, everybody remains within the Democratic Russia. So, I would not exageate the importance of things that have happened. [end recording]

Congress Ends

LD2804151191 Moscow TASS in English 1458 GMT 28 Apr 91

[By TASS correspondent Sergey Novozhilov]

[Text] Moscow April 28 TASS—The Russian Democratic Party today ended its congress in Moscow.

The congress approved the party rules and a number of other documents. According to the rules, the party, having over 33,000 members, opposes using violence to resolve social, ethnic, religious and other conflicts.

The congress also adopted the party's programme. Debates on the programme have resulted in a split in the Party. Some observers had predicted such a split before the congress.

In his report, Party Chairman Nikolay Travkin accused opposition in the Party of impeding its normal functioning in the past months. In response, opposition leader Garry Kasparov, heading the Moscow Democratic Party Organisation, said Travkin's course was the reason for existing differences and difficulties.

The split followed the vote on the alternative draft programmes, proposed by Travkin and the opposition. Most delegates supported Travkin's draft.

In protest, opposition leaders Kasparov and Arkadiy Murashev turned in their Party membership cards and left the congress, accompanied by over 100 delegates, some 25 per cent of those present at the congress.

The adopted programme reads that the Party opposes the Soviet Communist Party's monopoly on power, seeing it as the main obstacle to moving the country out of the "deadlock" of social tension and economic dislocation.

The Party considers it necessary to focus on increasing its membership, prepare for elections and establish close contacts with other political forces in the republic.

The congress nominated Boris Yeltsin to the post of Russian Federation president.

Joint Session Supports Stabilization Efforts

LD2604204991 Moscow TASS in English 2023 GMT 26 Apr 91

[Text] Moscow April 26 TASS—A joint session of the chambers of the Russian parliament supported today the joint statement on measures for stabilising the country, signed on April 23 by President Gorbachev and leaders of nine Union republics. On behalf of the Russian Federation the statement was signed by Chairman of the Russian parliament Boris Yeltsin.

A special resolution, approved by 152 votes with seven against and five abstentions, pointed to the "importance of this document for the future of peoples of the Russian Federation" and expressed support for the programme of the stabilisation of society and the preservation of the federal state.

The legislators approved at today's session the agenda of the fourth Congress of People's Deputies of the Russian Federation that opens in Moscow on May 21. The main items of the agenda will be the adoption of the law on executive presidency in the Russian Federation and amendments to the republican constitution following the introduction of executive presidency.

The parliament adopted almost unanimously the law on the rehabilitation of nations that fell victim to repressions. Hundreds of thousands of Soviet people were forcibly evicted from their native land during the Stalin regime. The law envisages the return of the evicted nations to the areas of their traditional settlement and the restoration of national-territorial borders. head of the Russian parliament Boris Yeltsin stressed in this connection the need for settling possible territorial disputes "in a civilised manner."

Today, on the fifth anniversary of the Chernobyl tragedy, which involved enormous loss of life and the radiation contamination of vast territories, Russian legislators approved after first reading the blueprint of the law on the social protection of people exposed to irradiation as a result of the Chernobyl catastrophe. Its consequences were especially devastating in the Ukraine, Belorussia and Russia.

Gorbachev-Republics Joint Statement Supported

LD2604173191 Moscow TASS in English 1659 GMT 26 Apr 91

[Text] Moscow April 26 TASS—At a joint meeting of its chambers today, the Russian parliament supported the joint statement on measures for the stabilising the situation in the country, signed by leaders of nine Union republics and Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev on April 23. For the Russian Federation the statement was signed by Chairman of the Republic's Supreme Soviet Boris Yeltsin.

In a special resolution adopted by 152 votes with seven votes against and five abstentions, the parliament noted "the importance of this document for the destiny of Russia's peoples".

The Russian parliament expressed its support for the programme of stabilising society and preserving a federal state.

The parliament decreed to start without delay the implementation in Russia's territory of anti-crisis measures envisages in the "statement of ten".

The parliamentarians also pointed out the need to speed up the drafting of a union treaty and to urge individuals, work collectives and parties to refrain from civil disobedience actions.

The adoption of the resolution was preceded by a brief but quite a stormy debate. Supporters of the statement spoke of the need to back Boris Yeltsin's effort to establish normal relations with [the] Union leadership. Their opponents declared that the statement of April 23 damages Russia's sovereignty.

The viewpoint summed up by prominent historian and writer Dmitriy Volkogonov has finally prevailed. He stated the need to support Boris Yeltsin and equated the signing of the statement to the peace treaty of Brest-Litovsk (the treaty that was signed in 1918 by Lenin's government with Germany and thus enabled Russia to withdraw from the world war). Volkogonov said that the signing of the statement by Boris Yeltsin was a "bold step", but unless measures stabilising the situation in the country are taken "the entire work will be reduced to zero".

Agenda for Congress of People's Deputies Approved

LD2604114891 Moscow TASS in English 1109 GMT 26 Apr 91

[By TASS parliamentary correspondents Boris Zverev, Yuriy Kozmin, and Andrey Surzhanskiy]

[Text] Moscow April 26 TASS—The Russian Federation parliament, prior to the beginning of the main meeting, today endorsed, on a suggestion from parliament President Boris Yeltsin, an agenda of the Fourth Congress of Russia's People's Deputies, to begin on May 21.

The first item on the agenda is the endorsement of a law "On Presidency in the Russian Federation" and the introduction of amendments and agenda to the republican Constitution in view of instituting the post of a president of Russia.

The agenda also includes items concerning republican presidential candidates and the endorsement of a law "On a Constitutional Court of the Russian Federation and Its Election".

After adopting the agenda of the fourth congress, members of the Russian parliament honoured by a minute of silence the memory of people who had died because of the accident at the Chernobyl nuclear power station this day five years ago.

The accident is known to have entailed particularly heavy consequences on the territories of the Ukraine, Belorussia and the Russian Federation.

In Russia alone, the number of people who directly suffered from the Chernobyl accident exceeded two million. More than 600 residents of Russia took part in eliminating the aftermath of the disaster and a large number of them have been incapacitated, according to the parliamentary commission for social policy.

The Russian parliament today is expected to consider a bill aiming to protect citizens who were exposed to radiation as a result of the Chernobyl accident.

The members of parliament will also consider today a Russian Federation bill on the privatisation of housing stock. The bill is to lay down basic principles for privatising state and municipal housing on the republic's territory.

The parliament session agenda also includes a bill on the rehabilitation of the Russian Federation's peoples who were subjected to repression in Stalinist times.

Supreme Soviet Endorses Statistics Chairman

LD2704191691 Moscow All-Union Radio Mayak Network in Russian 1800 GMT 27 Apr 91

[Text] A meeting of the Presidium of the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic [RSFSR] Supreme Soviet was held today under the chairmanship of Comrades Yeltsin and Khasbulatov. It endorsed the republic's children of Chernobyl program, which is to be implemented during 1991-95. The Presidium discussed the implementation of land reform in the RSFSR. The draft RSFSR laws on the privatization of state and municipal enterprises and on personal investment accounts and deposits were examined. It was decided to forward these to committees and commissions of the Supreme Soviet. Provisional regulations on the RSFSR State Committee for Statistics were adopted. Guzhvin was endorsed as chairman of the committee.

The RSFSR Supreme Soviet Presidium adopted decisions on spending for the RSFSR presidential election and on the organization of the election for the post of mayor of Moscow on 12 June 1991. Other matters pertaining to state affairs in the RSFSR were also examined.

Yeltsin Addresses Supreme Soviet on Chernobyl

LD2604113391 Moscow Central Television Second Program Network in Russian 2013 GMT 25 Apr 91

[Speech by Boris Yeltsin, president of the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic (RSFSR) at the RSFSR Supreme Soviet session in Moscow on 25 April; from the "RSFSR Supreme Soviet Session" program—recorded]

[Text] Esteemed people's deputies: Tomorrow is one of the blackest dates in the history of our country, primarily for three republics: the Ukraine, Belorussia, and Russia. On 26 April, five years ago, the accident at the Chernobyl Nuclear Electric Power Station [AES], one of the biggest technological catastrophes of the 20th century, occurred. It has literally ruined the lives of hundreds of thousands, if not millions, of people; doomed families to painful ordeals; and gravely injured Slavic republics. The poisonous cloud swept over other countries of the world.

The scale of the Chernobyl consequences was aggravated by the fact that irresponsibility and the traditional neglect for people's lives became a barrier to doing everything possible after the accident. There is no justification or forgiveness for those who, hiding behind the

smoke screen of secrecy, not only failed to assist in taking necessary measures but, in fact, blocked them. It is with bitterness that one realizes that we, the deputies of the Russian Supreme Soviet, cannot say that we have fulfilled our duty to the sufferers in the fullest way possible.

Today, five years after the explosion at the nuclear station, many children and their parents who live in the zones of the accident are ill, and old folks cannot stop worrying. We have not done everything to minimize the calamity that befell those people. Not only words of sympathy are needed on this sad anniversary. One should continue to step up the practical work aimed at overcoming the consequences of the disaster. One of the main conditions of this is for joint efforts by three fraternal Slavic peoples and to ensure constructive cooperation of all the political forces that express their interests.

Esteemed people's deputies, the draft indeed contained the issue of submitting a draft law on social protection for the citizens who had been subjected to radiation following the disaster at the Chernobyl AES. Two committees have amendments to this law. Therefore, the Supreme Soviet perhaps will agree with the following procedure: to give instructions, in precisely such an interpretation, including certain amendments of committees—of two committees, including the committee for legislation... [changes thought] to give instructions to adopt the decision—the presidium will gather on Saturday, the Presidium of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet—and to adopt it in full. After all, powers have been redistributed here, and on Saturday the Presidium could adopt such a decision.

[Unidentified speaker] And they will harmonize it over these two days.

[Yeltsin] If anybody has amendments, please submit them to committee so that they can be taken into account during discussion by the Presidium on Saturday. Any objections? No. I would like to take a vote on this proposal.

[Unidentified speaker] There are objections.

[Yeltsin] Well, vote, please. Let us vote, let us make it clear what the majority is here. You see, we would not like to have certain doubts and so on when discussing such a very delicate issue. The document should be elaborated in such a way that it could be adopted in full and without any doubts.

The proposal has been adopted. Then the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet, the Committee for Legislation, and other committees are instructed to examine it in full by Saturday. Any amendments and proposals that people's deputies may have should be submitted to the committee, and on Saturday we will examine and adopt this decision.

[Unidentified speaker] A law, not a decision.

[Yeltsin] Well, the Presidium cannot adopt a law, only a decision; but in full, the way it is being presented. Perhaps we should no longer dwell on this issue; it is simply embarassing before the television viewers to wrangle over this issue. I will ask people's deputies to agree in order to continue with the agenda.

29 Apr Rally To Endorse Yeltsin Presidency

PM2804122991 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 27 Apr 91 p 1

[S. Stupar report: "Signing for Yeltsin"]

[Text] It seems that Boris Yeltsin's election campaign will get under way Monday. In any event the "Democratic Russia" movement and the "Sotsprof" ["Socialist Trade Union"] alternative trade union association are intending to hold a Moscow-wide demonstration and rally on Manezh Square on 29 April, with a view to nominating Boris Yeltsin as candidate for the Russian presidency. In order to do this they will need to collect 100,000 signatures.

Democratic Russia Nominates Yeltsin for President

LD2704133591 Moscow TASS in English 1306 GMT 27 Apr 91

[By TASS correspondent Lyudmila Aleksandrova]

[Text] Moscow April 27 TASS—The Democratic Russia Movement today nominated Russian parliament Chairman Boris Yeltsin to run for president of the largest Soviet republic at the June 12 elections.

The decision was passed at the plenum of the movement's council.

The Democratic Russia movement, which took shape last year, while assisting Boris Yeltsin's political comeback, is now the Russian leader's main powerbase and the key force opposing the Soviet Communist Party.

It aims to coordinate democratic forces opposing the Soviet Communist Party's state and political monopoly, according to its charter.

Although the plenum upheld Yeltsin's nomination, several speakers blasted him for signing a joint statement on measures to stabilise the situation in the country and overcome the crisis.

The statement, signed by Yeltsin, President Mikhail Gorbachev, and eight other republican leaders, was welcomed by many as a step towards stabilisation and away from the standoff between Russian and central authorities.

However, radicals criticised the statement as a "concession" to President Gorbachev and a sign of Yeltsin's weakness.

They blasted a ban on strikes and the introduction of a special working regime in key industries, envisaged in the statement.

Democratic Russia Coordination Council co-chairman Yuriy Afanasyev said the statement "put us in a difficult position".

"We will have to support Boris Yeltsin and, at the same time, be frank about the statement," he said.

"We will support Boris Yeltsin, but we will criticise him," Coordination Council Co-chairman Lev Ponomarev told TASS.

"Many miners write us that Boris Yeltsin betrayed them," Ponomarev said, commenting on a flood of letters of protest to the movement's headquarters.

The statement had a negative impact on Yeltsin's popularity, he said.

The plenum demanded that Boris Yeltsin explain his position on television.

The Democratic Russia organisation was formed last October and unites some 1.3 million members, according to its leaders.

Bakatin Nominated for RSFSR President

LD2704150191 Moscow All-Union Radio Mayak Network in Russian 1330 GMT 27 Apr 91

[Text] Vadim Viktorovich Bakatin, a member of the country's Security Council, was nominated as a candidate for the post of president of Russia today. This was the decision of a general meeting of the "Avangard" collective farm in Kirov Oblast. The meeting called on all people from the same district to support this nomination. Bakatin once headed the oblast party committee in Kirov.

Warning Protests Staged by Unions in RSFSR

LD2604134591 Moscow Radio Rossii Network in Russian 1100 GMT 26 Apr 91

[Text] Warning protest actions by the trade unions are being staged in the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic. According to data of the headquarters of the Federation of Russian Independent Trades Unions, about 2 million people have by now been attending meetings and rallies in Maritime and Khabarovsk Krays, on Kamchatka, in Magadan and Sakhalin Oblasts. Over 80 percent of works kollektivs have been taking part in a warning strike. Work was halted for one hour at Artem and Primorskaya ports, as well as at Severovostokzoloto association and the Ustkamchatskiy maritime port.

Yeltsin, Kryuchkov To Discuss Russian KGB

LD2704152191 Moscow Radio Rossii Network in Russian 1348 GMT 27 Apr 91

[Text] In the very near future, leaders and heads of USSR KGB [Committee for State Security] directorates in at least 10 Russian oblasts will be replaced. This information was given to a RUSSIAN INFORMATION AGENCY correspondent by a well-informed person who wished to remain anonymous.

In particular this concerns Voronezh, Penza, and Gorkiy Oblasts as well as Krasnodar Kray. According to this information the new KGB leaders will be appointed on recommendation of CPSU oblast committees.

These cadre changes, to all appearances, should be implemented before the creation of the Russian Committee for State Security, the question of which will be discussed at a meeting between Boris Yeltsin and USSR KGB Chairman Vladimir Kryuchkov on 5 May.

RSFSR Politburo Member Assesses Congress

91UN1374A Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 23 Apr 91 pp 1-2

[Article by A. Sokolov, member of the Politburo and secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the RSFSR and people's deputy of the RSFSR: "With Concern for the Fate of Russia"]

[Text] Passions following the recent third congress have yet to cool, but the fourth, which will be preceded by a session of the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] Supreme Soviet, is following on its heels. There involuntarily comes to mind Pushkin's "One dawn hastens to replace another, giving night half an hour...."

Now, following the third, special, congress, arguments are being encountered in the media about the fact that this congress was "thought up by the Communists" and that there was no need for it. Let us try and see whether this was the case or not, and for this let us recall certain events which preceded the congress.

So, January 1991. B.N. Yeltsin's infamous trip to the Baltic and his signing in Tallinn of a number of documents, including an appeal to the United Nations. Neither action, as was subsequently ascertained, was sanctioned by either the Presidium or the Supreme Soviet of the republic. Nonetheless, following his return, the Supreme Soviet assembled, 10 days ahead of the planned date, and an unscheduled matter was brought up for discussion also—the situation in the Baltic. Following the tendentious report of the Supreme Soviet chairman, just as tendentious a draft decree with one-sided assessments, very far from the true state of affairs of the situation in Lithuania and the other Baltic republics, was proposed. But, in spite of all the endeavors of Democratic Russia to win approval from the Supreme Soviet, the draft was turned down. In addition, when approval

of the results of B.N. Yeltsin's trip to the Baltic was proposed at separate meetings of the chambers, only one-third of the deputies, approximately, voted for him. As a result of a debate lasting several days, an entirely different document was adopted—a decree on the situation in the Russian Federation, which proposed measures which might have stabilized our life. But this, unfortunately, has not happened.

Then, as you know, the Supreme Soviet essentially rejected the measures proposed by the government providing for the functioning of the economy in the current year. Failure followed failure, and a crisis was brewing in the Supreme Soviet. It was intensified even more when the Supreme Soviet was forced to study material pertaining to the sensational "140 billion rubles" affair and adopt a comprehensive decree with the perfectly definite conclusion: The Russian Government displayed incompetence in consenting to this deal. G.I. Filshin, deputy chairman of the RSFSR Council of Ministers, was removed from office for flagrant violations.

And you remember how insistently the Supreme Soviet Presidium pushed through, in violation of the Constitution and the Referendum Act, what is more, its decree on the holding of a Russian referendum! The numerous breaches of the law evoked a stormy response and the rejection of the referendum itself in a number of republics and oblast soviets of the Russian Federation, which refused to conduct it on their territory.

All this evoked the deputies' concern. But they were troubled most by the rapid slide of the economy of Russia and the whole Union into chaos, the continued disruption of business ties, the lack of balance of the plans and the threat of a halt to production. A crisis was growing in agricultural production also, and the danger of starvation was becoming real. Add to all this the exacerbation of interethnic relations in various regions of the country, in South Ossetia included, which was being reflected in the situation in the Russian Federation also, the considerable growth of crime, the orgy of mass-meeting anarchy, the increased confrontation of the Russian leadership and the center.... One further "flash point"—disagreements in the corps of deputies in connection with the conclusion of the Union treaty. Attempts had been made to forget about the commission for elaboration of the Union treaty, which had been formed at the second congress, but the Presidium was forced, nonetheless, to assemble this commission only on the deputies' insistence, on 5 March, that is, three months later!

The avowed rejection on the part of certain political groupings calling themselves "democratic" as regards the Union referendum, their attempts to thwart it and their calls for a "No!" to the Union should be recalled also. And the numerous violations of the laws and anticonstitutional enactments, I refer primarily to the creation of the Supreme Advisory and Coordinating Council under the auspices of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet chairman. Everyone knows full well that this matter was not agreed either in the Presidium or the Supreme Soviet, although the functions entrusted to the council should be made official constitutionally. The financing of the advisory and coordinating body and its staff should go through the corresponding commissions of the Supreme Soviet, not be decided by a stroke of the pen. In a word, this evoked natural puzzlement: Were power structures parallel to the Supreme Soviet being formed? The deputies have still not received an answer to this question, incidentally.

So the idea of convening a special congress was in the air. V. Tsoy, cochairman of a group of organizers of the national economy, was the first to address such a proposal to a meeting of the Supreme Soviet session. This was followed by a request for the convening of a special congress by 272 deputies, the same decision being adopted by two oblasts soviets—Smolensk and Orel. And shortly after there appeared the political statement of six leaders of the Supreme Soviet.

All these are events and facts which are well known to everyone, and I recall them merely because some people have already begun to shamelessly juggle and distort them, proceeding from their own political considerations, of course. Attacks on the Communists are being stepped up increasingly. Unconcealed pressure on those who demanded a convening of the congress, nonparty persons included, began immediately, however. A desire to remove the chairman of the Supreme Soviet and the government was attributed to them. Unprecedented persecution of the authors of the political statement both in the media and locally was unleashed. Passions were inflamed even more by B.N. Yeltsin's television interview on 19 February and, particularly, his speech in Cinema House on 9 March.

But the Supreme Soviet proved to be above personal political ambitions and adopted the decision to convene a special congress. The decision was dictated by one thing—concern for the interests of the peoples of Russia and their life and fate.

The communist deputies drew up and submitted a program of a way out of the crisis and of the social reorientation of Russia's economy and also a draft federal treaty and proposals for the Union treaty. So we came to the congress not to destroy, which has traditionally been attributed to us by our opponents, but to propose, seek and find optimum solutions. But, unfortunately, like the past one, this congress also began with fierce attacks on the communist deputies, who were virtually accused of a conspiracy and subversive activity.

From the first hour representatives of Democratic Russia attempted to turn the congress into a mass-meeting channel. The insistent pushing of the question concerning the introduction of a presidency in the RSFSR inflamed passions. People came back to this matter practically every day, although it had been determined on the first day of the congress that it should be worked up by the Supreme Soviet and the subjects of the

federation and then submitted to the next congress. No, we had to move more quickly; no, right now! This was probably seen as the main goal by those who did not want a convening of the congress at all.

Attempts were made to insert on the agenda the Decree on Power. The purpose of the proposed document was essentially to settle accounts with the Communist Party. But this question was turned down by the congress also.

In a word, there was much in the way of heated arguments and emotions, and too little time was left, on the other hand, for a constructive, thorough discussion of the people's needs and of how to achieve a stabilization of the situation. Some 241 deputies spoke in the first four days of business of the congress, 168 of them on procedural matters, what is more, and only 33, on matters of substance. How much time was killed in empty verbiage and mass- meeting posturing! Yet the agrarian deputies and the representatives of various sectors of the national economy and other deputies also had constructive proposals.

The decree on the first item was adopted with difficulty, more than 200 amendments were proposed, after all! Much is being written currently in certain media about the fact that both B.N. Yeltsin's report and the proposals of the Council of Ministers presented by I.S. Silayev gained the support of a majority of people's deputies. Without getting into an argument, I would like merely to recall one point. When the amendment of Deputy F.V. Shelov-Kovedyayev, who proposed supplementing the decree with the words "to approve the propositions and conclusions contained in the report of the chairman of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet," was put to the vote at the congress, only 377 deputies out of the more than 950 who took part in the vote voted for this amendment. No comment needed, I would think.

The congress turned down the idea of a "roundtable," believing that it is necessary first and foremost to undertake a restoration of business ties and the stabilization of the economy, scheduled examination of the question of the presidency for the next congress and rejected the idea of departyization.

The main thing, in my view, is the fact that the congress made an evaluation of the situation in the Russian Federation and pointed out that precise legal mechanisms of interaction between the republic and Union bodies had yet to be defined and that legal nihilism was being observed within the Russian Federation. It was emphasized that the RSFSR Supreme Soviet and its bodies and the RSFSR Council of Ministers had not made full use of the authority accorded them for stabilization of the political and socioeconomic situation in the RSFSR, an improvement in the life of Russians and a way out of the crisis and that "there are serious shortcomings in the fulfillment of a number of decisions of the congresses of people's deputies of the RSFSR." That is, the congress agreed in principle with the arguments adduced in the political statement of the six leaders of the Supreme Soviet. The decree proposed a whole number of measures pertaining to a way out of the most serious crisis situation, and it may be hoped that now both the Supreme Soviet, having acquired additional authority, and the Council of Ministers will work more actively.

So to believe that the congress was assembled to no purpose is simply to dissemble. The chairman himself in his closing remarks evaluated the discussion of the first item as constructive.

I have to mention the speech of Deputy A.V. Rutskiy, who read out a statement on behalf of the Communists for Democracy group of people's deputies. You will recall that he accused the deputies of the Communists of Russia group of adopting a conservative, destructive position, making the congress unworkable and so forth. All this resembled a political performance, and was furnished with "noise effects" and applause, and some deputies, mainly representatives of Democratic Russia, even rose here. All this was immediately portrayed as a split in the Communists of Russia faction, and there was a throng of articles in the press about the "death throes of communism" and the process of disintegration within the CPSU and the creation of new structures.

We are talking about a planned action, which was aimed at a division of the CPSU. What the "Democratic platform" had failed to achieve at the 28th congress people are now attempting to realize via the congress of Russian deputies and the deputy structures in the local soviets and are thereby attempting to break up the party. But it needs to be said plainly here that such actions are contrary to the CPSU Rules.

I am now often asked what the reason was for the statement of the chairman of the Supreme Soviet concerning a redistribution of power and whether this was necessary. I would like to hope that both the Supreme Soviet and its chairman will avail themselves of the additional authority primarily to stabilize the economy, conclude a Union treaty as quickly as possible and organize intra-Union relations. But, I confess, I am consumed with doubt. Judging by the night interview given by B.N. Yeltsin immediately following the congress, he has quite different intentions, in respect to personnel, including primarily those he finds disagreeable. This is worrying.

On the whole, however, I would evaluate the congress' decision on the redistribution of power as follows: Having transferred practically all authority to the Supreme Soviet, it could become essentially a ceremonial assembly on the occasion of the confirmation of the new constitution and an inspector of the laws which are enacted by the Supreme Soviet. This would be a big loss for democracy, of course.

Please do not misunderstand me. I am by no means questioning the possibilities of the Supreme Soviet. But

questions connected with amendments to the Constitution, personnel issues, questions on the form of government—these come within the jurisdiction of the congress. And for this reason I am firmly convinced that the decision on the redistribution of authority should have been adopted by two-thirds majority, as a constitutional provision. This was not the case, alas. Time will, of course, show to what end the authority was sought. If for the good of the people and for an improvement in their life, people will evaluate this on its merits. If, however, for a strengthening of authoritarianism, this will lead to no good.

Now about items two and three of the congress agenda. There was no fundamental discussion of them. In my view, there were several reasons for this.

The first was the superficial, vague, and imprecise report of R.I. Khasbulatov—simultaneously on the two items, but more precisely, deliberations on the subject of the national-state arrangement and the Union treaty. Ruslan Imranovich was expressing more his personal viewpoint than making a comprehensive analysis of these documents, proposals and so forth. His speech evoked, it has to be said, the deputies' disapproving response. And after the decree on the redistribution of authority had been adopted, it was felt that certain deputies' interest in items two and three had passed. The speeches were hereupon reduced to five minutes, there were demands for the debate to be wound up and representatives of the autonomies were not allowed to speak as they should have been. Documents were adopted as a basis without serious discussion. It became perfectly apparent that some deputies had come to the congress in order, having discussed the situation in Russia, to attempt to somehow extricate it from the crisis, and others, to satisfy purely political ambitions.

The Fourth Congress of People's Deputies of the RSFSR is scheduled for 21 May. Presidential elections are scheduled for 12 June. The haste with which the leadership of the Supreme Soviet is attempting to organize these elections is simply astonishing. After all, upon completion of the congress' business, in the two weeks prior to the elections, the presidential candidates will not only not have time to give an account of themselves in an election struggle nor even simply to acquaint the electorate with their programs. Nor is this accidental, I believe. The aim is very transparent: securing an advantage for one candidate. Which one is clear also.

Nonetheless, the Supreme Soviet has in the period remaining to adopt many decisions taking account both of the actual situation and the alignment of forces in the republic in order that the very process of election of a president serve the cohesion of society, not its further delineation. Account should also undoubtedly be taken of the opinion of all the republics and autonomous formations which are a part of the Russian Federation and the results of the Union and Russian referenda. A balanced position of the Supreme Soviet and the government of the republic in the search for ways out of the crisis and a search for harmony in Russia is needed now more than ever—and the congress has emphasized this repeatedly. The RSFSR can and should set an example by signing the Union treaty, once again showing the peoples of other republics that Russia was and remains a bastion of friendship and cooperation.

Western Republics

Minsk Strike Committee Suspends Action

LD2604140491 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1202 GMT 26 Apr 91

[By TASS correspondent]

[Text] Minsk, 26 Apr (TASS)—Late last night, the Minsk strike committee voted to suspend the political strike until 21 May—the day when the next session of the Belorussian Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR] Supreme Soviet opens. However, as a TASS correspondent was told at the strike committee's press center, assembly lines are not operating in the motor-vehicle, tractor, and engine works, and some small enterprises and organizations are continuing to strike.

The tight knot of contradictions has been untied in Orsha, too, where strikers stood on the rails for a total of some 12 hours and blocked the movement of trains on one of the country's vital routes. At 2100 yesterday, after talks between Belorussian USSR people's deputies and the leadership of the local strike committee, life returned to the station. The results of the stubborn confrontation are lamentable. According to information from the administration of the Belorussian line, one train in 10 has had its schedule disrupted, and about 20 trains have been sent on roundabout routes adding 200 km to the journey. According to preliminary estimates, losses amount to 100,000 rubles not counting those borne by the freight recipients.

The strike has been suspended in most oblast centers in Belorussia. In Gomel, however, the collective of one of the town's largest enterprises, Gomselmash [Gomel agricultural machinery], intends, in the afternoon, to bring people out to the central square where a mass meeting will be held to mark the fifth anniversary of the Chernobyl accident.

Today, the Belorussian capital started its first morning this week in a calm and businesslike way. There are no large columns of people moving from factory gates toward the city center. Labor collectives are preparing to take part in the Way of Chernobyl—a procession of mourning through the city streets as far as Friendship Park, where a memorial sign will be unveiled in the evening—the forerunner of a future monument to the victims of the Chernobyl catastrophe.

Belorussian Leader on Reason for Price Protests

LD2704220891 Moscow Central Television First Program Network in Russian 1800 GMT 27 Apr 91

[Interview with Vyacheslav Frantsevich Kebich, chairman of the Belorussian Council of Ministers, by correspondent A. Zhuk; place and date not given; from the "Vremya" newscast—recorded]

[Text] As you will recall, the joint statement signed by the USSR president and heads of nine republics cited concluding a new treaty of sovereign states which takes account of the results of the all-Union referendum, as one of the priority measures to bring the country out of crisis. This wording—a treaty of sovereign states—arouses special interest among many people today. This was the first question our correspondent asked Vyacheslav Frantsevich Kebich, chairman of the Belorussian Council of Ministers, one of the signatories of the document.

[Zhuk] How do you see this real sovereignty of our Belorussia?

[Kebich] We are currently examining those issues which relate to the powers we are to hand over to the new Union. These powers, I think will be very few in number. Everything else we shall wholly take on ourselves; we thereby really shall act as a sovereign state in that council.

[Zhuk] [video shows copy of PRAVDA on table before him] Let us look further at this document. It points out that you, the leaders of nine Union republics—in the future sovereign states—proposed that the USSR Cabinet of Ministers and the government of the republics should for two weeks examine the actual situation regardng prices, and adopt a coordinated decision on issues which are giving rise to the greatest social tension. We know that social tension is far from being a simple matter here. That is, social tension is evident here in Belorussia.

[Kebich] I should state that this issue should perhaps have been put first, because everything that is happening, including in Belorussia, is a consequence precisely of this price increase. Here, of course, very many mistakes have been made. I should answer quite unambiguously that the people had every justification to go out onto the square and to state their criticisms against both the governments of their republics and the government of the USSR. Why? Because for many people, many issues connected with price reform were unexpected.

[Zhuk] Yesterday, though, the square was not seething and full of noise like it was before. No tens of thousands of people gathered; the strike has been suspended.

[Kebich] This, I think has happened primarily because in the final analysis, in my view, the government of Belorussia did the maximum it possibly could—and at times even what it could not—in order to stop the pressures of this price reform.

Chernobyl 'Catastrophe' Fifth Anniversary Marked

2 Million Risk Contamination

LD2604192791 Moscow All-Union Radio Mayak Network in Russian 1800 GMT 26 Apr 91

[Text] This morning's session of the Ukrainian legislature began with a minute of silence. Deputies honored the memory of those who perished as a result of the Chernobyl atomic power station accident five years ago.

On the occasion of the fifth anniversary of the Chernobyl catastrophe, the Supreme Soviet of Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic adopted an appeal saying inter alia that as a result of the accident in the Ukraine alone about 2 million people have found themselves at lethal risk of radioactive contamination, along with many towns, farmlands, forests, rivers, and the air. But the most bitter losses are the thousands of human lives. It is essentially a question of a national tragedy whose consequences are not yet fully understood.

Foreign Aid Provided

LD2604185291 Moscow TASS in English 1823 GMT 26 Apr 91

[By TASS correspondents Veronika Romanenkova and Sergey Ryabikin]

[Text] Moscow April 26 TASS—About 100 tonnes of medication and baby food were brought today from the United States to Moscow by a Ruslan airliner, one of the most powerful modern planes. The cargo, intended for victims of the Chernobyl catastrophe, will be transported by three planes and by trucks to Bryansk, Gomel and Kiev.

U.S. aid was sent to the Soviet president, the same as mobile medical laboratories turned over by Japan today. The Sasakawa Foundation from Japan purchased and sent to the USSR by a special Ruslan flight five laboratory automobiles for the medical check-up of people exposed to irradiation, as well as other medical equipment. Mr. Sasakawa and his son allocated from their resources 40 million dollars for humanitarian aid to Chernobyl victims. In addition, the foundation allocated money to five Soviet universities (one million dollars to each of them) for training medics. Cargoes worth a total of 150-200 million dollars will come from Japan for Chernobyl victims.

The accident at the Chernobyl nuclear power plant five years ago became a tragedy for hundreds of thousands of Soviet people. The state register of people exposed to irradiation includes information on 539,000 people; 280,000 of them live in the Bryansk, Kiev, Zhitomir, Gomel and Mogilev regions—in the so-called tough control zones, which are still exposed to irradiation. Constant medical control, medication and ecologically safe food are needed for keeping their health in a satisfactory condition.

Igor Prostyakov, deputy chairman of the commission for the distribution of food and medication coming from abroad, told TASS that a considerable part of humanitarian aid goes to the areas adjacent to the Chernobyl nuclear power plant. A dramatic growth of medication deliveries from Germany is expected, he said. According to Prostyakov, the Foundation for Social Humanitarian Aid, created recently, will discuss on Monday a possibility of rendering financial assistance to that region and its residents.

Aleksey the Second, patriarch of Moscow and all Russia, conducted a divine service at the Epiphany Cathedral today. He prayed for the well-being of those who lost their health as a result of the exposure to irradiation after the Chernobyl accident. He also conducted a mourning service together with other top-ranking clergymen to commemorate victims of the Chernobyl tragedy.

UN Mission Arrives in Minsk

LD2704085291 Moscow TASS in English 2158 GMT 26 Apr 91

[By TASS correspondent Tatyana Khryapina]

[Text] Minsk April 27 TASS—A United Nations mission led by Under-secretary-general Margaret Joan Anstee, director-general of the Vienna office and coordinator of the United Nations system for alleviation of the consequences of the Chernobyl nuclear disaster, arrived in Minsk on Friday.

The delegation is to assess the amount of aid needed by the republic which sufferred from the accident at the Chernobyl nuclear plant. Almost one-fifth of Belorussia's territory with a population of over two million was then subjected to radio-active contamination. Over this period the total number of congenital malformations in new born babies increased by 18 per cent. The growth in the number of malformations is even greater in the Gomel and Mogilyev regions, zones of rigid control.

The U.N. mission met with Belorussian Chairman of the Council of Ministers Vyacheslav Kebich and deputy chairman of the republic's parliament Stanislav Shushkevich. During the conversation Margaret Anstee was familiarised with measures being taken in the republic to clean the aftermath of the Chernobyl nuclear accident. Margaret Anstee said that she will exert every effort to call the attention of governments, non-governmental organisations and individuals in all countries to Chernobyl problems.

The head of the U.N. mission participated in charities devoted to the fifth anniversary of the programme. Before the beginning of a concert she read out a message from United Nations Secretary-general Perez de Cuellar in connection with that tragic event.

The address says that a number of specialised organisations of the United Nations have already taken important measures to fulfil a resolution adopted by the U.N. General Assembly. The initial plan of assistance is being worked out in close contact with the governments of the USSR, the Belorussian and the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republics, as well as non-governmental organisations and authorities of the contaminated territory.

International Help Urged

LD2704130191 Moscow TASS in English 1218 GMT 27 Apr 91

[By TASS Correspondent Aleksey Petrunya]

[Text] Kiev April 27 TASS—The Ukrainian cabinet on Friday issued an address to foreign parliaments, governments, public and international organisations and movements on the occasion of the fifth anniversary of the Chernobyl nuclear power plant disaster.

In all languages Chernobyl is a warning, reminder and a call for international efforts in the struggle for human survival, the document says.

The cabinet, on behalf of the Ukrainian people, thanked the world for its help to Chernobyl victims.

The Ukrainian government pledged to continue taking measures to protect the people and environment. The republic has been declared an environmental disaster zone.

The cabinet also called for international help in efforts to clean up contaminated areas, resettle people from these territories and monitor public health.

Official's Fears Noted

LD2504204891 Berlin ADN in German 1940 GMT 25 Apr 91

[Text] Berlin [no date as received] (ADN)—The head of the legislative investigative commission on the consequences of Chernobyl [as received] Vladimir Yavorivskiy, fears a dust explosion in the fourth reactor block of the Chernobyl nuclear power station. For this reason the solution to the problem requires "the entire world's intellectual capacity," Yavorivskiy stated in an interview with the Berlin-based newspaper DER MORGEN (Friday edition).

Yavorivskiy stated that there are around 800 dumps in the Soviet Union—many of them unknown—in which waste, demolition tanks, machines, concrete, and nuclear fuel are "simply buried" in unsuitable ways. Even the reactor itself is located on a geological fault in the layers of the earth where the water table is very close to the surface. Now the water of the Dnepr is almost as radiocatively contaminated as the water inside the reactor, because the central government in Moscow did nothing. The head of the investigative commission expressed the fear that "either in the short or the long term the entire industrial south of the Ukraine which takes its drinking and utility water from the Dnepr will be without water supply."

Asked about people's exposure to radiation, Yavorivskiy said that in the meantime it has become a matter of the country's future, "of nothing less than the nations' genetic code." He recalled that in many places "calves are regularly being born with five legs or three eyes." In his opinion, the gruesome truth is "that the same thing awaits humans in three to four generations."

Yavorivskiy made strong accusations against the Soviet Nuclear Energy Ministry. The authority used the money collected by children and donated by pensioners and working people to pay off its own debts instead of using it on Chernobyl. This was ordered by former Prime Minister Nikolay Ryzhkov.

The contaminated area has become "the feeding crib for the central state authorities." Twenty million rubles have been spent on the area around the reactor without a single official document. However, "nothing has arrived on the spot." For this reason the "problems of the century" can only be resolved by an independent state.

Ukrainian Students End Strike 25 Apr

LD2604135291 Kiev International Service in Ukrainian 0000 GMT 26 Apr 91

[Excerpts] The Ukraine's strike committee has called on the population of the republic to support the striking miners by proclaiming an all-Ukrainian political strike for 25 April. The most tense situation today was in the Donetsk region. That region has been the center of coal miners' strikes in the Ukraine since 1 March. [passage omitted] The situation in Donetsk was even more aggravated than ever. The appeal for an all-Ukrainian political strike was supported not only by the already striking miners, but by some other enterprises.

In the neighboring Luganśk region practically all local enterprises were working except seven striking mines in the town of Pervomaysk. A similar reaction was in Pavlograd, Dnepropetrovsk region, where eight mines were working as usual, and the miners of three nonworking coal mines went on a political strike.

In Kiev people began to gather at the city's central square of the city, that is the October Revolution Square, early in the morning. In the square there were already representatives of striking miners from Donetsk, Lugansk, Dnepropetrovsk, Lviv, and Volyn regions, who these days are negotiating with the Ukrainian Government. There were sharp discussions during that meeting, especially on the issue of the miners' strike, namely, if it is reasonable to hold a strike. Another meeting was held in downtown Kiev before the end of the work day. This time its participants were mainly students, school children, pensioners, although there were also representatives of the industrial enterprises of the city. The participants demanded resolute measures to be taken by the Ukrainian Cabinet of Ministers to relax social tensions as a result of the recent price rise introduced by the central bodies of power.

The student strike ended today in the Ukraine. This was announced at the sitting of the coordinating council of the Ukrainian Student Union. As its chairman, Volodymyr Chemerys, stated, the students have said they have trusted the Ukrainian Supreme Soviet for the last time. By the demand of the striking students, the Ukrainian Supreme Soviet took upon itself an obligation to consider the problems of the youth comprehensively next May.

Snegur Cables Gorbachev on Banking 'War'

LD2704111991 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1213 GMT 26 Apr 91

[By TASS correspondent Fedor Angeli]

[Text] Kishinev, 26 Apr (TASS)—The MOLDOVA SUVERANE newspaper today published a telegram from Moldovan President Mircha Snegur to Mikhail Gorbachev and Valentin Pavlov. In particular it points out that despite his appeals to the country's leadership with a request to halt the anticonstitutional actions of the leaders of the Dnestr region, the measures taken by the Union Government are late.

The Moldovan leader has accused the leaders of the Dnestr region of undermining the republic's single banking, financial, and tax system. A Dnestr bank with banks from a number of towns and rayons of this region in its make up has been created in Tiraspol with the support of the administration of the USSR Agroprom Bank. Other financial and banking services which refuse to submit to republican institutions have also begun functioning here. The creation of a Dnestr bank is a real basis for separating the budget and taxes of the Moldovan Soviet Socialist Republic and the Dnestr Republic, the creation of which was ruled unconstitutional by the Moldovan legislature, from 1 April this year.

At the moment a real financial war is in progress between Kishinev and Tiraspol. Dnestr enterprises and institutions have ceased to contribute to the republican budget. The republican government in its turn has ceased financing all budget organizations in this region, and also sending capital investments.

The telegram from Mircha Snegur to the Soviet leaders says that under these conditions the republic cannot be responsible for fulfilling the previously undertaken Union budget obligations, and also a number of economic agreements.

Caucasus

Georgian Resolution on Post of President

AU2904103491 Tbilisi NRZAVISIMAYA GRUZIYA in Russian 10 Apr 91 p 1

[Resolution of the Supreme Soviet of the Republic of Georgia on the introduction of the post of president of the Republic of Georgia issued in Tbilisi on 9 April]

[Text] In order to improve the state structure of the Republic of Georgia and strengthen the country's sovereignty and the rights and security of its citizens, the Supreme Soviet of the Republic of Georgia **resolves**:

1. To consider it expedient to introduce the post of president of the Republic of Georgia.

2. To entrust the Commission on Legislation and Protection of the Law of the Supreme Soviet of the Republic of Georgia with elaborating and submitting its proposals on the corresponding legislative amendments.

Signed by Z. Gamsakhurdia, Chairman of the Supreme Soviet of the Republic of Georgia.

9 April 1991. Tbilisi.

Armenian Surrender of Party Building Delayed

LD2604222891 Moscow TASS in English 2106 GMT 26 Apr 91

[By TASS correspondent Tigran Liloyan]

[Text] The Armenian Council of Ministers granted the request of the Central Committee of the Armenian Communist Party and permitted it to put off until April 30 the surrender of the building in which the Central Committee is housed and of the property it contains.

This government decree was adopted today in connection with the third stage of the 29th congress of the Armenian Communist Party which opens on Saturday. The Republican Council of Ministers issued instructions to ensure all the necessary conditions for the congress.

As is known, the Armenian Parliament on April 17 adopted a decree on the nationalisation of the property of the Armenian Communist Party. Next day the Armenian Government determined the procedure for stock-taking and surrender of the Party's nationalised property. This procedure should be concluded within a week beginning with April 22.

The plenum of the Armenian Communist Party Central Committee and Secretariat of the Soviet Communist Party Central Committee disagreed with this decisions. By his decree of April 23 Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev qualified this decree of the Armenian Parliament as null and void and halted the implementation of the appropriate decision of the Armenian Council of Ministers.

Armenian Communist Party Holds Congress

LD2804042191 Moscow Central Television First Program Network in Russian 1800 GMT 27 Apr 91

[Report by correspondent V. Nararyan on the work of the 29th Armenian Communist Party (CP) Congress in Yerevan on 27 April; from the "Vremya" newscast—recorded]

[Text] The main issue the delegates will discuss at the current and, presumably, final stage of the congress is the present situation and the tasks of the republican party organization. It should be said that the six months that have elapsed since the end of the work of the second stage have not only not strengthened the communists' positions but also have aggravated them even further, especially since the republican legislature adopted a resolution on nationalization of the property of the CP and the former Komsomol of Armenia. In the period between the second and third stages, 12 delegates renounced membership of the CP and 20 declared themselves unwilling to participate in the work of the present stage of the Communists' forum. Demands were voiced at the congress for the expulsion from the party of these comrades and those Communist deputies who voted for adopting the resolution on nationalization. The majority of congress delegates, like the Central Committee plenum just before the congress, decisively assessed that document as unlawful, having no juridical force, and not promoting the stabilization of the situation in the republic. The congress adopted a proposal to set up a conciliation commission which would, together with the republic, embark on searching for a compromise solution. What this solution will be is hard to say. For the moment, the Armenian Council of Ministers has met the Central Committee's request and has suspended implementation of its decision on handing over Central Committee buildings and the property in them to a Yerevan city soviet commission until 30 April, in connection with the work of the congress.

Refuses To Give Up Building

LD2804072191 Moscow TASS in English 0632 GMT 28 Apr 91

[By TASS correspondent Tigran Liloyan]

[Text] Yerevan April 28 TASS—The Armenian communist party, dogged by falling membership and scathing attacks from political opponents, held a congress on Saturday to devise a coordinated policy and decide whether to comply with a parliamentary demand to return its property.

The Armenian parliament recently passed a decision to nationalise party property in the republic.

After a sharp debate on the issue, participants decided to "be firm" and not to return the building of the communist party headquarters.

The congress called on the republic's parliament to reconsider nationalising communist party property, saying the decision violated Soviet and Armenian laws.

Mutalibov Statement Warns Armenians

NC2704202891 Baku Domestic Service in Azeri 1700 GMT 27 Apr 91

["Text" of statement by Azerbaijani President Ayaz Mutalibov; place not given, dated 27 April 1991—read by announcer]

[Text] For the fourth consecutive year the blood of innocent people in the Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast [NKAO] is being shed. The acts of robbery, arson, and murder continue without interruption. It is the fourth year now that the nationalist forces in Armenia, which fan and persistently instigate interethnic discord, have brought grief, tears, and deprivation to the people. The cause of this dispute is the baseless land claims against Azerbaijan.

Hundreds of thousands of refugees, who have lost their property, are unjustifiably suffering from deprivation. They are expecting aid from the state, which is suffering from a serious economic crisis itself.

Regardless of their hypocritical claims that they support democracy and a humanitarian approach, the Armenian leaders authorize the unpunished distortion of even the most ordinary norms and rules of interstate relations within the Soviet Union, which comply with what is practiced at international level. Disregarding the decision adopted by the USSR Supreme Soviet, the Armenian Supreme Soviet has not yet abrogated its anticonstitutional resolutions calling for NKAO's unification with Armenia. (?Telegrams) were sent from the NKAO to the Armenian Supreme Soviet in violation of the constitutions of the Soviet Union and the Republic of Azerbaijan in 1990. Disregarding the numerous appeals for the termination of interference in Azerbaijan's internal affairs, Armenia has unjustifiably and shamelessly continued its wide-ranging acts of terrorism in our republic—which are in reality armed attacks—for more than three years now.

Modern arms, military equipment, and field radios are being supplied to the Armenian rayons. Mountain (?paths), transport vehicles, and helicopters, which violate Azerbaijan's airspace without being punished, are being used for that purpose.

The Armenian Government's decision on the rights of the Armenians in Azerbaijan to defend themselves with arms has brought to light its aggressive intentions. By creating a wrong impression in public opinion on the so-called threat by Azerbaijan and by strengthening the hatred in the Armenian people, the Armenian leaders have established their own armed forces with a view to maintaining their position in power and realize their ambitions. Furthermore, Armenia has not yet responded to the proposal made by the Azerbaijan Supreme Soviet in mid-1990 for the establishment of a five km wide state of emergency zone in the territories of the two republics. Considering the need to protect its territory against the uninterrupted attacks by the bandit groups, the Republic of Azerbaijan has unilaterally realized this proposal with the help of the USSR Ministry of Internal Affairs Internal Troops. The side that is defending itself has now become evident. It is common knowledge that Armenia has no reason to fear anyone in its own territory. This is because, thanks to its policy of eviction, not a single Azerbaijani has remained in Armenia.

Nevertheless, the Armenian leaders have not stopped making hypocritical disclosures on the forced expulsion of Armenians from Azerbaijan. Obviously, their views are unfounded and untrue. Also obvious is the fact that the activities of the extremist and nationalist forces in the NKAO are obstructing the normalization of the situation and the reestablishment of the government organs in the NKAO. These activities are also placing tens of thousands of Armenians in Azerbaijan in a difficult position. Not becoming infuriated by the activities of the Armenian nationalists, who have been killing their own brothers for being friendly with the Azerbaijanis, is impossible.

The patience of the Azerbaijani people has been exhausted. We demand that interference in Azerbaijan's internal affairs be halted immediately. The NKAO problem will be resolved in that oblast, that is, within Azerbaijan. Each and every Armenian who lives on this land must decide for himself whether he wishes to live in peace and safety in accordance with the Constitutions of the Soviet Union and the Republic of Azerbaijan and on the basis of good-neighborly relations or whether he wishes to search for his food outside our republic.

We demand that a five km wide border zone be established in Armenia. We demand that the flights of helicopters over Azerbaijan's territory and the attacks on Azerbaijan's border towns be halted immediately. We demand that the leading officials of the USSR Ministry of Internal Affairs, Ministry of Defense, and State Committee for Security to put into effect in the NKAO the USSR president's decree on the disbanding and disarming of the armed bandit groups and fully implement the measures called for by the legal regime that was set up by the state of emergency law. We demand that those involved in the disruptive and separatist activities in Azerbaijan leave the republic voluntarily. Those who incite interethnic discord will be forced to account and they will be punished in accordance with the laws. We demand that NKAO's Sergi town be immediately freed and attacks on train machinists on the Megri section of the Azerbaijan railway tracks be halted.

We have trusted the USSR Government, the USSR Ministry of Internal Affairs, the USSR Ministry of Defense, and the USSR Committee for State Security with the safeguarding of the republic's sovereignty and territorial integrity. We are confident that they will fulfill their constitutional commitments toward the people of Azerbaijan. Nevertheless, we are determined to defend

our borders and obstruct the criminal objectives of the Aremian terrorists and the armed banditry groups with our own forces.

If our demands are not fulfilled, we shall be left with no alternative other than putting into effect economic and other sanctions against Armenia with a view to realize our demands for the sake of our republic's security. This is the will of the people of Azerbaijan.

[Signed] Ayaz Mutalibov, president of the Republic of Azerbaijan. Baku City. Dated 27 April 1991.

Mutalibov Supports Union of Sovereign States

LD2704133991 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1525 GMT 26 Apr 91

[By AZERINFORM-TASS correspondent Natan Barskiy]

[Text] Baku, 26 Apr (TASS)—Without a single union of sovereign republics and cooperation between the economies of all its component states, the achievements of the six years of perestroyka within the country have no real meaning. This was said by Ayaz Mutalibov, president of the Azerbaijan Republic (Transcaucasus), as he commented on the treaty concluded by the USSR president with the leaders of nine republics, in the signing of which he participated directly.

"The joint statement on urgent measures to stabilize the situation within the country and to overcome the crisis takes as its starting-point the interests of the people," Mutalibov noted. "What is needed is further advances in the democratization of society and the practical development of the salutary processes begun in 1985. They must take place at the same time as the deepening and radicalization of economic reform with the compulsory implementation of measures for the social protection of the population."

Speaking about the need for the firmest restoration of order established by the Constitution, and the observance of laws, Ayaz Mutalibov recalled that the republic has, on more than one occasion, requested the country's leadership to, as he phrased it, "put the nationalists in Armenia and the separatists in the NKAO [Nagornyy-Kharabakh Autonomous Oblast], who have overstepped the mark, in their places," but no firm measures were taken. "For that reason, we think that the center, to which the functions of guarantor of security have been delegated, must perform its functions without reminders, calls, and appeals," Mutalibov stressed.

Having noted the importance of the rapid conclusion of a new Union treaty for overcoming the political and economic crisis, the president of Azerbaijan also emphasized the need for the subsequent adoption of a new Constitution that would consolidate the creation of a union of sovereign republics.

Azeri President on Russia's Future, Problems

LD2804170391 Moscow Radio Rossii Network in Russian 1115 GMT 28 Apr 91

[Report by unidentified correspondent on remarks made by Azerbaijani President Ayaz Mutalibov, including recorded remarks by Mutalibov in response to questions from correspondents at Thirty-Three Plus One, an international women journalists' club, in Baku at the "end of March," not further specified]

[Text] It has already become a tradition that correspondents from other contiguous republics, as well as their leaders, take part in Radio Rossii's programs. Today, I would like to offer you two short extracts from a news conference which took place at the end of March—the material was a bit late reaching us but it hasn't in the least become obsolete. It took place in Baku and was held by Ayaz Mutalibov, president of the Azerbaijani Republic. He was answering questions from correspondents from the international women journalists's club, Thirty-Three Plus One.

So, we have two extracts. In one of them the president of Azerbaijan replies to a question about his attitude to the leadership of Russia and the processes that are taking place in our republic. We'll talk about the other one a bit later:

[Mutalibov] Here is what I think. Every one of the politicians active in Russia at present should be very careful. Russia is the whole country. You know, the Russian leaders should not imitate the leaders of Armenia, Georgia, or Azerbaijan. In Armenia we have a mono-nation; we, essentialy, too, are a mono-nation; Georgia, too, so to speak, if you look at the structure. In Russia there is a conglomerate, and Russia's state structure is made up of autonomies through and through. It's a federation.

In a little while the Russian leadership will be left hanging in mid-air, because you will get presidents at every level there. They are already there—Tataristan, Bashkiristan, Yakutiya, Udmurtiya, Chuvashia, and so on. Every one is entitled to their own land; and there you have it. So now I don't know—where in Russia is Yeltsin going to put the Russians.

I think that processes are under way there which are very dangerous for the country as a whole. You cannot set the Russian Federation and its leaders against the center. I would like to say that with all the shortcomings that are today present in the policies of the center and its leaders, and the president himself, at the same time you have to understand that we are going along an unexplored road. We are going for something that perhaps previously no one would have dared to go for. We all have to help so that it works out. You see how it is?

I, for instance, very much envy the United States, the citizens of the United States. Look at the high sense of respect in these people. Every one of them considers

themselves a citizen of the United States, respect for the flag, and respect for the anthem. The Americans have managed, in spite of the racial discrimination on which we were building Soviet propaganda in the 1930s, 40s, 50s, 60s, and even 70s, to achieve this kind of understanding of the sense of citizenship, homeland, and so on. America managed it. It followed our road.

By the way, the so-called capitalist world has assimilated the most valuable things from socialist ideology; it assimilated them, armed itself with them, and realized them. While we are now going toward what capitalism started from. I think that's a mistake. You cannot, in a devil-may-care manner, or free and easy way typical of our Soviet man, wholly solve such fundamental problems without taking into account the realities of life. How can you view the level of democratic transformations as an average for all peoples of Azerbaijan? Can you compare metropolitan centers to (?villages)? It is impossible to transform a giant country like the Soviet Union at a stroke, in a flash, in 500 days, to a diametrically opposite ideological basis. If anybody maintains so, that's simply adventurism; it's simply some kind of, let's say, crude populism. That's my point of view. I always say so and I am not ashamed to tell you so now.

[Announcer] So there's a view from Baku of what is taking place in Russia. The second question to Ayaz Mutalibov, president of the Azerbaijan Republic, asked by women correspondents at his news conference—how does he evaluate the fact that perhaps it's the only republic in the still existing Union where the communists have gained power in the elections with a large majority. Here is what the president replied:

[Mutalibov] The fact that today we are in control of the situation does not to any extent indicate a return to the situation that used to be in our country when the Communist Party held sway. Not at all. This proceeds from the real circumstances that I have already spoken of. We can see that for the time being, at this stage, for the sake of the transformations that are taking place in the country, for the sake of them not turning to a hard confrontation and bloodshed, so that life in our republic does not become worse than under that which we criticized today by speaking of stagnation, we have to settle down to ensuring this course in Azerbaijan, to understand that we have to consolidate. We have to take account of the realities of life, we have to reckon with the political forces which today have entered the arena, but at the same time we must point out the shortcomings that they have, too.

I can tell you that today the intellectual and professional potential is on the side of the Communist Party. It has assimilated the best forces that there are today. I am not a professional Party worker, I am not an apparatchik, as they say. I have gone through life, starting from school, and working all the time. I worked in the hardest conditions and experienced all the charms of the system. Consequently, I do not intend being the kind of Communist which is today portrayed all over the place and whom they are trying to trip over everywhere—you know, a communist isn't human, it's this kind of thing with a square face, stupid, with a total lack of intellect, like nothing on earth, and so on. It's a monster. I am against that, because I myself am not a monster. I am a fairly civil, intelligent man; I think intelligently and work intelligently. I understand that we have to transform our society further, since everything that we could have got over the 73 years, through good or bad methods, all that is now history.

That is why I cannot completely agree that we are consolidating a regime, a Communist regime in Azerbaijan, by supressing a democratic regime. No. If tomorrow on Azerbaijan's political stage there appears a force which can take the republic with it, we shall peacefully give it preference, and shall adjust ourselves, too, in order to carry on alongside them. But not along the road of bloodshed, not along the road of confrontation, and not along the road of defamation. Not along the road which leads to civil war.

[Announcer] Well, one can hardly disagree with the final words of Ayaz Mutalibov, president of the Azerbaijani Republic. As far as the possibility of building, by the majority of communists, that which they want, which they want to do in the republic, well, if they manage to do it in a single republic, I think it would be a great, creative, and historic success.

Central Asia

Uzbek President on Republics' Joint Statement

LD2804205791 Moscow Central Television First Program Network in Russian 1800 GMT 28 Apr 91

[Report by unidentified correspondent on meeting between USSR president and nine republican leaders in Moscow, including interview with Uzbek President Islam Abduganiyevich Karimov; date and place not given; from the "Vremya" newscast—recorded]

[Text] The joint statement by the 10 on stabilizing the situation and overcoming the crisis continues to be broadly commented upon in our own and in the foreign mass media. I would remind you that nine republics and the USSR president have agreed to adopt a new Constitution no later than six months after signing the Union treaty, and on its basis to hold new elections to the Union organs of power. Basically, this means that the strikers' political demands will be met. Republic leaders who signed the agreement have already taken part in our program. Today we are continuing to acquaint you with the standpoint of those who affixed their signatures to this document.

[Karimov] In my opinion we have only two paths today. The first is to reach agreement and to find common accord with the demands of the Union republics, to sign the Union treaty, to resolve all contentious issues, to

install firm, vertical executive power, to establish constitutional order, and on this basis to address all of those acute issues which worry the Soviet people and the whole of our society. The second path—if you can put it like that—is the path of using force; only dictatorship can save our society. There is no third way, in my view. So, the entire sense of our work, which was conducted, I would say, under the leadership of Comrade Gorbachev—and this is the first time that I have observed such an accord among the main republics of our country—all of this work shows once again that we have no third way.

[Correspondent] Islam Abdunganiyevich, what is the meaning of cardinally enhancing the role of the Union republics, without which it is currently unthinkable of overcoming the crisis? This appeared in the statement's conclusion.

[Karimov] We don't want to acknowledge that we must give a precise and clear assessment of the fact that the republics are currently the centers where political, economic, and all other issues are actually being tackled. Without understanding this, without realizing this, and without making a precise assessment of this, I think it's impossible to resolve the mass, the range of all the problems which are currently overtaking us. The point is that the political and ethnic awareness of the peoples of the national republics has grown to such an extent—and this has to be realized—that there can be no return to the old ways. There is only one way and having realized all this, having understood today's and tomorrow's role of the Union republics, it is possible to find a way out of the chaos, out of the abyss which we are currently entering.

Kyrgyz Communist Party Makes Leadership Changes

LD2804194491 Frunze SLOVO KYRGYZSTANA in Russian 9 Apr 91 p1

[Summary] Today's paper carries an information report on a plenum of the Kyrgyzstan Communist Party Central Committee on 6 April which discussed organizational issues. Masaliyev was released as first secretary, and Amanbayev elected instead.

A.D. Sulaymankulov was elected second secretary and member of the Kygyzstan Comunist Party Central Committee bureau.

V.I. Artemov and T.S. Aytbayev were elected secretaries and members of the Kyrgyzstan Communist Party Central Committee bureau.

N.M. Chepelev was released from his posts as bureau member and central committee second secretary and chairman of the Central Committee Commission for Renewing the Activity of Primary Party Organizations and Cadre Policy. He is leaving the republic.

M.Sh. Sherimkulov and M.I. Paryshkuru were released from their posts as Central Committee secretaries and bureau members.

A. Dzhumagulov, V.K. Kandakov, and U. Sydykov were released as bureau members.

D. Asankulov and T. Tabyldiyev were released as candidate bureau members.

The plenum turned down Masaliyev's request to be released from his duties as a member of the Kyrgyzstan Communist Party Central Committee.

The plenum released M.F. Vasilenko from his duties as head of the Kyrgyzstan Communist Party Central Committee Organizational Department, and V.G. Mamontov from his duties as head of the Agrarian Policy Department. It confirmed R.A. Sarymsakov as head of the Orgazational Department, Sh.I. Kudabayeva as head of the Socio-Economic Policy Department, and V.D. Karapysh as head of the Agrarian Policy Department.

The plenum decided to rename the Communist Party of Kirghizia the Commnist Party of Kyrgyztan.